NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME VI.---NO. 34. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 22, 1846. WHOLE NUMBER 294.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman,
Edmund Quincy, } Editors.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

"The Peculiar Institution."

From the Albany Patriot.

SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 30, 1845.

Charles A. Wheaton, Esq. Syracuse:

DEAR FRIEND—Your letter of inquiry about the case of Sarah Carter, to your brother, Mr. Horace Wheaton, M.C. was put into my hands by him. I suppose it was referred to me, because it seemed appropriate to come within the scope of business assigned to the *bureau of humanity*. I have thought it proper, therefore, to submit a brief report directly through you to our mutual constituents and associates. I hope the offering will not be wholly destitute of interest or practical value.

Thomas Monroe formerly came from Annapolis, Md. to this city, and was City Postmaster, probably through the administration of Mr. Monroe, and that of Mr. Adams. Upon the accession of General Jackson and his friends to power, he was displaced. He is now an old man—wealthy—of the higher aristocratic class, and a member of St. John's Church, which is within rifle shot of the bronze statue of Jefferson, standing in front of the President's house. Many years ago he bought a woman and her two young daughters from Prince George's County, Md. where they were raised by *Bishop* Meade! The mother has now been dead some years. One of the children by the name of Sarah, grew to maturity and became the cook and *maid of all work* in Mr. Monroe's family. She had two daughters by some connection, in respect to which I have received no definite information. One of these daughters, a few years ago, fortunately made her escape from here, and now resides in your village, as I am informed. The other is still here, a slave, the property of a Mr. Walsh.

The week that Com. Decatur was killed by Com. Barron, in a duel, which I find to be the 22d March, 1820, a man, by the name of Luke Carter, who had obtained his freedom, went to live with Mr. Monroe, as his coachman. Subsequently he became the husband of Sarah, who has been before referred to. He has continued to serve Mr. Monroe on wages from that time up to last October—twenty-five years and a half—without reproach or complaint. The Carters have raised five children who served the old master's family as they became old enough. Mr. Monroe, for many years past, has rented them a small tenement in the corner of his yard, for which Carter paid him two dollars a month, regularly, deducted from his wages, which were twelve. The children have all been provided for by the father and the extra exertion of the mother. Mr. Monroe has never paid a dollar for them in any way, has never provided food or clothes—Carter's wages have all been consumed in bringing up the family. In the meantime the eldest daughter of this family had reared seven children of her own. These two families, as you perceive, consisted of Sarah Carter, and five children—her oldest daughter, Mary, also having seven children—in all thirteen. Some day in October last, Mr. Monroe, without a previous hint to them, or any alleged reason, sold these families to Williams, the broker in humanity in this city. By the way, Monroe owns the PEN, as it is called, and rents it to Williams, on a lease of five years at a time. Immediately Williams ran them off to Richmond. Poor Carter had not an opportunity to say farewell, or shed a father's and husband's tear over them at parting.

In a day or two, however—as soon as he could recover a little from the stunning effect of the calamity, by which he had been so suddenly stricken down, he followed them to Richmond. He found them, and learned they had been sold on the block to a trader from Nashville, and were destined to the Georgia market in the first instance. He applied to Wilson, the trader, to know on what terms he would sell his family to him. He consented to take $3,650 for them, and gave Carter a memorandum to that effect, but afterward, by a trick, got it away from him. Carter, half beside himself, uncertain what to do, came back again, and for a few days tried to resign himself, as best he could, to his overwhelming cup of sorrow. He could not eat—sleep fled from his eyes—after consulting with his friends, and obtaining some articles of necessity and comfort to carry to his family, he started back and found them near Richmond, at a little place called Manchester. He applied again to purchase them, and was told by Wilson that a man in Richmond would buy them all, and they could live there together.—The partner of Wilson went with Carter and his wife, under the pretence of finding the purchaser.—Cunningly he got them separated, and locked Sarah up in one of the jails. The husband finding his wife locked up, and suspecting some trick, immediately returned to his children, whom he found brought out of the jail and ready to start for Georgia. They were expecting their mother—amidst shrieks and tears which broke his heart, the poor father was compelled to tear himself away from his children, and set his eyes upon them for the last time.

He soon found that Wilson had swapped off his wife to one Botts, who is the Postmaster at Manchester. They had been started off in the morning in pursuit of a purchaser, for the purpose of getting Sarah away from her children. Botts consented to take two hundred and fifty dollars for his wife, and a Mrs. Walsh of this city, whose husband is absent in South America, advanced the money—taking a bill of sale of Sarah—on condition it should be repaid in March.

Sarah Carter is a woman of good character, and one of uncommon smartness in her condition. She hopes, with a mother's heart, yet to redeem her children from bondage! She is willing to wash night and day to accomplish it. Her age is about fifty-two—has a hale, good constitution. Luke Carter is a man of about seventy years of age—his character for integrity and uprightness is unimpeachable—his understanding is uncommonly strong and clear for one with his advantages—he made a profession of religion in the Methodist church, a little before the burning of the capitol and the skirmish with the British at Bladensburg, in August, 1814, and has maintained it without taint or reproach to his time—more than thirty-one years.

There are eleven jails in Richmond, the capital of Virginia, which are constantly crowded with victims. The railroad train never arrives without a freight of misery. A day never passes, without sales in the street, from the auction stands. The Sabbath is the day of greatest activity in the traffic. The screams and wailing of sundered families, the crack of the drivers' whip, and the echoes of the auctioneer's infernal voice are perpetually commingled in terrific din. I have no appeal to make in behalf of Sarah Carter. The tale is told, and cannot fail to be understood. Those whose hearts prompt them to give for her relief, can entrust their benefactions to you, or send them directly to me, and they will be faithfully applied. Without donations from the North she will still be a miserable slave.

I have thus stated this case at length—too minutely, perhaps, it will be thought—not because there is in it any hardship or infliction more appalling than is to be met with every day and in every instance of human brokerage. My object in doing it is twofold. We are apt to regard the cruelties and atrocity of Slavery as a great, abstract whole, and therefore they fail to make the impression upon our sensibilities, which would impel us to determined action.—Here are the features of a single case, in no way peculiar, but naturally and inevitably arising out of the relation of master and slave. I regard it, too, of great consequence to bring every act of this sort, well defined, distinctly to the public attention, with names, places, and dates. In this way we have driven the infamous trade to a great extent from this District, and must now follow it up; and attack it in the capital of the "Old Dominion," *now its stronghold*. I have no comments to make. I had intended to have some pretty plain talk about stupid and shuffling ministers and churches at the North, and also about hard-hearted, selfish politicians, and unthinking citizens, by whose consent and co-operation the slaves are made such, but I leave to you and others to draw such inferences as this case will justify. I have just returned from an interview with this outraged and suffering family, and am filled with inexpressible grief and shame!

You have long been, my friend, one of the few unshrinking advocates of the crushed slave. It has cost you time, money, *caste, and popularity*; but I do not believe you will ever regret any efforts put forth in this cause. If there is anything sweet and blessed in the domestic relations—if Christ's gospel is not a dream—if the idea of eternal rewards is not a delusion, I am sure you will rejoice most of all in this part of your history.

With a brother's heart, yours, W. L. C.

A NEGRO THIEF.

A notorious negro thief, named Yoeman, was arrested in this county on the night of the 27th ult. about a mile from this place. The said Yeoman has been engaged in running negroes from Thomas and Lowndes counties, Ga. and Jefferson County, Florida, for some time. The citizens of these counties, we learn, have suffered to the amount of $10,000 by this man. He is now on his way to Florida, under the charge of Messrs. Mallory, Brinson, and Adams, where it is to be hoped the aggrieved laws will have ample satisfaction.—*Albany (Ga) Courier. 7th inst.*

HORRIBLE CASE OF LYNCHING.—A noted negro thief, by the name of Yoeman, having been arrested near Albany, Baker county, Ga. and subsequently discharged by Judge Warren on a writ of *habeas corpus*, was immediately re-arrested, says the Savannah Republican, and under charge of Messrs. Mallory, Brinson, and Adams, conveyed at once to Florida. On this way thither, he confessed to the gentlemen in whose charge he was, that he was one of an organized gang of negro thieves and murderers—that during the Florida War they had carried on their operations under the guise of Indians, and that since the war they had stolen negroes in Thomas and Lowndes counties, Ga. and Jefferson county, Fla. to the value of $10,000. He confessed his crimes in detail, and offered them $1,000 cash for his release, alleging that if carried to Florida he knew he would be unceremoniously hanged.

On his arrival in Jefferson county, Florida, the citizens assembled to the number of ninety, and after an investigation of the facts, took a formal vote which resulted 67 in favor of hanging, and 23 against it. Yeoman was accordingly executed at 12 o'clock on 2d inst. The principal reason for this summary execution of the law was, the insecurity of their jails, and the fact of his having a band of accomplices in the community, who would, in all probability, have effected a release. A reward of $1,000 has already been offered by the citizens for the arrest of others known to be conected with him who has already suffered. One of those implicated was arrested a few days since, we are informed, near Newton, Baker county, Ga. and after the infliction of 75 lashes, released on the pledge that he would leave the State in five hours.

The Republican received these particulars from a gentleman in Baker county, who stated that he received them from others, and therefore that they might not be entirely accurate. But as to the main facts he had no doubt.

THE LYNCHING CASE IN FLORIDA.—The Baker County (Ga.) Patriot of the 7th instant, confirms the verbal intelligence already published, of a murder committed upon a wretch named Yoermans, by a set of regulators on the borders of Georgia and Florida. The Patriot says:

On Saturday night, the 27th ult. Yoermans was arrested a few miles below this place, obtained a release under a writ of habeas corpus, was re-arrested, and finally delivered up on Thursday last to the association of citizens who offered the reward in November last.

The scene which followed, we give from the mouth of an eye-witness. The citizens composing the association, to the number of about one hundred and seventy-five, organized at the line of Georgia and Florida, on Thursday morning, at 10 o'clock. A committee of twelve men, representing a jury, were appointed and sworn to try Yoermans for the offences with which he was charged. Witnesses were sworn, and his own confessions taken, all which went to prove that he had been engaged for several years past, with a number of others, *whom he named*, in stealing negroes, both slaves and free, and selling them in other States, and committing other depredations upon property. The trial lasted until nearly night.

The evidence having closed, the committee, representing a jury, returned a verdict of guilty. This was on the Georgia side of the line, between the two States. The Sheriff of Gadsden county, Florida, was present on the Florida side of the line during the early part of the day, but left before the trial closed. A motion was now put to deliver the prisoner into the hands of the constituted authorities of Florida This was decided in the negative by an almost unanimous vote. A vote was then taken as to what punishment should be inflicted. This was decided to be DEATH! by a vote of about six to one, and the time of execution fixed at 12 o'clock on the following day. The assemblage now crossed the line into Florida, where the presiding officer pronounced the solemn sentence of death. Yoermans fell, when he heard the sentence, as though he had been shot, but soon recovered, and asked the presiding officer to pray for him. *He called upon a preacher of the Gospel, three or four of whom were present, participating in the proceedings, to pray for the prisoner;* and strange to say, every man present knelt upon the ground, and joined in a most solemn and impressive prayer to God, that He would grant the wretched criminal that mercy which they themselves were in the act of refusing him!

A guard of twenty-five armed men was placed in charge of the prisoner, and the assemblage then dispersed, to meet again on the following day, and enact the last scene of this sad tragedy. Our informant left on Friday morning, and met a large number of persons who were going to witness the execution, which undoubtedly took place according to the sentence.

Thus we have given a plain statement of facts, which it is painful to record.

However guilty Yoermans may have been, or however worthy of death, the deliberate refusal to give him a trial in the regularly constituted Court, before an impartial Judge and jury of his country, when the laws were capable of reaching and punishing his crimes, was a fearful stab at the Constitution and laws of the country, which are the only sure guaranty of social order and individual security. A Justice of the Peace participated in the trial and condemnation. Had he forgotten his oath to support the Constitution, and to faithfully administer the laws? Had the preachers forgotten that they were the professed ministers of peace? Did those persons who occupy high places in society, reflect that the principle to which they were then giving the sanction of their acts, would, if carried out, unsettle the very foundation of society, and subject themselves, and all that they held dear or sacred, to the capricious will of an excited multitude?

Let every good citizen remember that if such lawless violence is to be tolerated in our country, the blood-bought freedom of our fathers the protection of our Constitution and laws, and the sacred rights of individual liberty and property are all a mockery.

Pro-Slavery.

From the New-York Globe.

ABOLITION LECTURE AT THE TABERNACLE.

The harangue which was delivered by the notorious Cassius M. Clay, on Monday evening last, was well attended, but not very well received; and it is highly probable that he would have been hissed from the rostrum if he had not been a stranger, for as Rhoderick Dhu says, "stranger is a holy name;" and as he was invited by the prominent leaders of the Whig party—though most likely at his own request—to address them, he was gently dealt with. There was a feeling of great uneasiness manifest in the congregation, however, and the orator (?) was more than once interrupted in the course of his speech, with ill-timed applause and awkward questions. One gentleman asked him what he meant by that paragraph in his incendiary paper, the *True American*, wherein he stated that there was "but a pane of glass between the infuriated negro mob in the street and the smooth-skinned woman on the ottoman, and the plate on the sideboard;" and insisted on his giving an explanation to the audience; but as this was a home-thrust query, some of the Whigs cried "turn him out," whereupon the interrogator defied them to do it, and though no one offered to lay hands on him, yet there was great uproar and confusion in consequence, and it was some time before order was restored. Mr. Clay denounced the annexation of Texas, and immediately the same gentleman shouted "three cheers for Texas," which were given with a good will by the audience. Horace Greeley, of course, was master of ceremonies, and negroes were so plenty in the company that they had the appearance of black pebbles on a sand beach. We understand that Mr. Clay will lecture again soon, and that tickets will be sold for admission at two shillings apiece. We have no desire to find fault with the arrangements of Monday evening, for we suppose they were got up in the regular abolition style, but there was one thing wanting to complete the show, and that was the presence of the editor of the *Louisville Journal* along side of the lecturer. If Clay wishes to make money "like dirt," he should get Prentice to accompany him wherever he goes, and be present with him on the rostrum when he preaches, for there are many persons in this city who would give upwards of considerable to see him and his fugleman together, especially as they two constitute the whole abolition party of Kentucky.

From the Mississippi Dollar Democrat.

PUCK ON ABOLITION.

We desire to draw the attention of rich and benevolent Southern planters to the deplorable fact that white slavery exists in the Northern and Eastern States of a most oppressive character. Good looking white men are there employed in the most menial offices, and in some instances are in the service of negroes! But this, though a dark and damnable feature in the social system in the free States, is not the blackest. Beautiful and intellectual white girls are there cooped up by hundreds in close prison-like buildings, and obliged to work like slaves, under overseers, from twelve to fourteen hours per day, for their wealthy masters, the manufacturers. Several times have these unfortunate white female slaves petitioned to be allowed to toil but ten hours a day for their cold-blooded task masters; but they have been spurned back to their day and night slavery. I, Puck, have a white man's feelings, and I cannot bear to read without indignation the heartless oppression of those avaricious Yankee slaveholders. Cannot something be done here at the South, for the abolition of white slavery at the North, and the emancipation of white niggers of both sexes generally, but the lovely female serfs particularly?

Selections.

From the Liberty Bell.

FUGITIVE SLAVES IN NORTHERN OHIO.

BY J. R. GIDDINGS.

It was on a pleasant evening in the month of May, A. D. 1840, just as the sun had sunk from view, when the laborers were returning from their fields, that a husband, wife, and two children, on foot, with wearied steps, were seen entering the village of ——, in Northern Ohio. The oldest child was a lad of some fourteen, the other a daughter, apparently two years his junior. Each carried a small bundle of what appeared to be clothing. From their dusky complexions, their anxious countenances, and their tattered dresses, it was apparent that they were fleeing from the land of bondage.

The people of the village were noted for their sympathy for the down-trodden slave. It was known for hundreds of miles as an asylum for the panting fugitive. The friends of humanity would direct his course to this, as a place of safety from the rapacious slaveholder, and the despicable slave-catcher. These facts were also known to the owners of slaves in Virginia and Kentucky. When they once learned that their locomotive property had directed its course to this village, they usually gave up the pursuit altogether, or came hither for it without further inquiry, hoping that by some means they might succeed in arresting their victims even in this citadel of liberty. So on the present occasion, the owner of the family to which I have introduced the reader, having found that the objects of his pursuit had bent their course directly for the village in question, made no further stop for inquiry, but with his two assistants, drove with all possible speed to the very place where the fugitive family had believed themselves safe from his fangs. In the meantime, the father, mother, and their little ones, on their first arrival, were welcomed to the house of a well-known friend of humanity, and, after being duly refreshed, were conducted in the darkness of the evening, to a neighboring house to lodge. This was done to prevent all trace of their whereabouts. But it so happened that even here, there were those whose tender sympathies are all in favor of the slaveholder, and are ready at all times to advocate the right of the oppressor to *his property*, in the bodies of their fellow-men. One of these had watched the movements of the friends of humanity, and when the slaveholder and his assistants arrived, at one or two o'clock the next morning, they found him in the road, ready, for a small compensation, to conduct them to the building in which the fugitive family were sleeping. Throwing him two or three dollars, without alighting, they desired him to point out the dwelling where the slaves might be found. Gathering up the price of his perfidy, without any further remark, he passed on before them, and stopping, silently pointed them to the door, and then, as if conscious of his guilt, disappeared and hid himself from view in his own bed-room. One of the slave-hunters remained with their horses, as if conscious that their property was not safe in a land where a man could be hired to betray his fellow-man; while the other two, with pistols and bowie-knives in hand, entered the dwelling, and demanded their slaves. Thus suddenly aroused from their slumbers, the inmates were dismayed at the loud threats with which they were saluted. They regarded escape as impossible, and suffered themselves to be seized and bound, and in less time than I have occupied in relating these facts, they were on their way toward a land of bondage. I will leave my readers to imagine the horror of these parents as they were thus compelled to turn their footsteps towards the scene of their former degradation, and, in contemplation, to behold themselves and children sold to the far South, destined to drag out a miserable existence upon the cotton or sugar plantations of Mississippi or Louisiana.

But the news of their escape spread rapidly through the village. There were, at the time of which we speak, several families of colored people residing there. Some of these had worn the galling chains of slavery, and all had witnessed its horrors. Some fifteen or twenty colored men and boys suddenly collected together, and some of them, in the excitement of the moment, armed themselves with guns, pistols, and other weapons. A proposition to pursue the men-stealers was made; and, as if actuated by one common impulse, all immediately started at full speed after their captured brethren.

The slave-catchers, with their captives, had not proceeded more than three or four miles, before they were overtaken by the colored people; and from the excitement apparent among them, and from their menacing tones, judged it prudent to seek safety in the first house which they could reach. Here they entered with their captives, and barring the door, threatened death to the first colored man who should enter. The house was immediately surrounded, guards were posted, and a regular siege commenced. The night wore away, and when the morning dawned, it showed to the besieged a large increase in the number of their enemies, but it exhibited to them no prospect of escape. No white man appeared to lend them succor: and the exasperation of the blacks appeared to increase with their numbers, and with the prospect of releasing their brethren from the grasp of their persecutors. Time continued to roll on, and the sun had nearly attained its meridian, when a man of small stature, bright hazle eye, of sober countenance and sedate manners, rode up, and engaged in conversation with the colored people outside of the building. Soon after, he applied at the door for entrance, and was gladly admitted.

When he had introduced himself to the slaveholders, he assured them of their perfect safety while he was with them; told them that he would protect them if they would accompany him to the seat of justice for the county, where they might have a legal trial of their right to hold the fugitives, with the benefit of counsel. The offer was gladly accepted, and they were soon under way for the place proposed. When they arrived at the seat of justice, they employed the only lawyer that could be found to espouse the cause of oppression, and the parties immediately appeared before a magistrate for the purpose of determining the claim of this Kentuckian to the bodies of the father and mother and children in question. Our friend, whom we introduced to the reader at the besieged house, appeared as counsel for the fugitives. He had long been known as a zealous advocate of liberty, and had often stood by those charged with the offence of loving freedom better than slavery. He was not unprepared on the present occasion; ready and able on all points touching the matter in question, he soon showed his opponents that they had others than slaves to deal with. The slaveholder found himself unable to prove his claim, and the captives were discharged. They then partook of such refreshments as their friends provided for them, and a small donation was made to pay their expenses across the lake, and in less than twenty-four hours, they were treading the free soil of Canada.

Not so with their persecutors. The friends of liberty felt the necessity of setting an example that should deter other slave-hunters from committing such outrages in future in that quiet region. The owner and his two assistants were charged with an assault and battery committed upon the persons of the parents and children of whom we have spoken. They were accordingly arraigned and ordered to find bail for their appearance at the next Court of Common Pleas, or to be committed for the want of such bail. By the aid of their lawyer, bail was procured, and they started with heavy hearts for Kentucky, to remain there some six weeks, and then to return and defend themselves for thus laying hands upon their fellow-men within the jurisdiction of Ohio laws. Their vexation and mortification was unbounded. But their profane railings were of little use; their bonds were signed, and could only be cancelled by their appearance in Court. In due time they set out on their return to Ohio. When they reached the village of M——, the owner of the slaves was taken severely ill, and died in a few days. His assistants proceeded to the place at which they were bound to appear, where one of them was taken sick, and was confined for a long time. The other made his appearance in Court with a most rueful countenance, and apparent dejection of spirits.

These judgments of a righteous Providence having fallen so heavily upon the slave-catchers, and their intended victims being now in a land of safety, the prosecuting attorney, after consulting with the Court, and with some of the leading philanthropists of the county, entered a "nolle prosequi" upon the indictment, and the two living defendants were discharged. Since that time few slave-hunters have been seen in "Northern Ohio."

JEFFERSON, Ashtabula Co. Ohio.

From the same.

LETTER FROM THOMAS CLARKSON.

PLAYFORD HALL, near Ipswich,
October, 3d, 1845.

DEAR MADAM:—I received your last letter, but was so ill at the time that I was unable to answer it for some days; and indeed I have recovered so little since that time, that I despair of being much better. My constitution is now, probably, as we say in England, "breaking up;" which I regret only, as it hinders me from being farther useful. I could have wished, perhaps, to have lived a little longer, but it would have been only for the sake of seeing the day when Slavery should terminate.—That its days are numbered I have no doubt; no more doubt than that I am now living; and the event cannot fail of being hastened on by what has happened in the case of Cassius M. Clay. The brutal treatment of him, and the outrages committed since by the white mob at Lexington, on the persons of the poor harmless black people residing in that city, will be a fine engine for the citizens of the North, with which to work.

I am very sorry that the present state of my health will not permit me to send you the contribution you desire against the forthcoming Fair. A particular circumstance has occurred which will stand in the way of performing what otherwise would have been a pleasure to me. An American, of the name of H. C. Wright, who has been in England, but more in Scotland, for sometime, and who has attended several Anti-Slavery meetings at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other places, to the great advantage of the cause, wrote to me a week or two before the receipt of your letter, to do him a great favor, which was, that as my history of the abolition of the Slave-Trade contained the facts relating to it only up to March, 1807, when the British Parliament put an end to it, he wished to have some little farther history of our proceedings in England since that time, so as to take in the rise and means by which Slavery in England was abolished also. He could get this, he said, (and he said truly,) from no other person now living but myself. I consented to furnish him with a little account—though far from well at the time—willing to oblige a person who had done so much for our cause, and thinking that it might afford pleasure to some of our friends in America. I agreed only to give him the facts, leaving it to him so to embellish it as to make it a readable little book. I had no other idea, however, than that it would be the work, on my part, of a fortnight only, though I had too many things on hand even to spare that time; but three weeks have passed, and as I am now a very slow writer, it will take three weeks more to finish the work. You will see, therefore, how impossible it is for me, when this work for Mr. Wright shall have been finished, and in my present state of health, to write anything fit to read, to be ready at the time of your Fair. I will just say, that I was the more induced to put myself to the trouble of writing on this occasion when I saw that in the Report of the Glasgow Female Anti-Slavery Society, Mr. Wright had given so lofty and yet so true a character of Mr. Garrison.

Notwithstanding I have said all this, I *will* think of a subject for the Fair, and will endeavor, if I can steal a few moments, at intervals, to begin it and go on with it; and if I can finish it in time I will send it you; but I must know what is the last day for receiving, at Boston, publications for the press.

And here I will ask a question. I have some memoirs of Henry Christophe, King of Hayti. I corresponded with him for three years, and put him in the way of making improvement for the good of his country, which I believe he followed. His only fault was that of being a too rigid disciplinarian; a fault, indeed, which I cannot palliate; but his intentions were noble, and his projects great, and he had a great mind. When I was at the great Congress at Aix la Chapelle, in Germany, trying to do something with the sovereigns of Europe, then assembled, in favor of the abolition of the Slave-Trade, I found, unexpectedly, in my pocket, a letter of King Henry, which I had unknowingly brought with me from my own house. This letter had in it remarks on education. I showed it to the Emperor of Russia. After having read it, he asked my permission to show it to the Emperor of Austria, and the King of Prussia. He did so—and told me that both of them were astonished at it as a letter coming from a black man: and all the three agreed, that though they spared no expense in getting *the cleverest men in Europe* to be their ministers, and to sit in council, no one of their then cabinet could produce a better letter. Now the publication of such memoranda in America might have a good effect in many ways, for however they might class the black man with the brute, in intellect, Henry Christophe, a man as black as jet, had powers of mind equal to those of any President in America. Would such a work do good, then, and *would it suit your Liberty Bell?*

I will finish my letter with a saying of one of the dearest friends I ever had, namely, General Lafayette. I was with the General often, and corresponded with him after his coming out of his dungeon at Olmutz. But the first time I knew him was when I was in Paris, the year after the French Revolution, on the subject of the Slave-Trade, and I assisted him materially. He was decidedly as uncompromising an enemy to the Slave-Trade, and Slavery, as any man I ever knew. He freed all his slaves in French Cayenne, who had come to him by inheritance, in 1786, and showed me all his rules and regulations for his estate when they were emancipated. I was with him no less than four different times in Paris. He was a real gentleman, and of soft and gentle manners. I have seen him put out of temper, but never at any time except when Slavery was the subject. He has said, frequently, "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America, if I could have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of Slavery." How would the people of Fayette county like to hear this?—to hear their land cursed by the man who gained it for them?

I remain, dear
Madam, yours truly,
THOMAS CLARKSON.

TO MRS. H. G. CHAPMAN.

From the New-York Tribune.

MR. C. M. CLAY'S LECTURE.

At the Tabernacle last evening was quite numerously attended, notwithstanding so many of our citizens had listened to the speaker the previous evening. The object of the lecture was to raise funds in aid of the association for the relief of colored orphans. Mr. C. was introduced to the audience by Hiram Ketchum, Esq. who made a few remarks in regard to the association, and the noble stand which Mr. Clay had taken on the great subject of human freedom!

Mr. Clay said it was with extreme reluctance that he had accepted the invitation to address the society. He was sure it would operate to his injury at home; but on learning the noble objects of the society, he had concluded to follow the dictates of his conscience, and let consequences take care of themselves. He had not found time even to note down the heads of a discourse, and what he should say must necessarily be from the impulse of the moment, and entirely without system. Mr. C. spoke about three-quarters of an hour, and was several times interrupted by the applause of his auditors.—He spoke in the highest terms of the purposes of the association, and went on to discuss the relations of the rich and the poor, the competition between labor and capital, &c. He adverted to the manner in which labor-saving machines are in some instances, by the grasping disposition of capitalists, made a curse to that class of citizens whom they ought especially to benefit—the laborers; and to the competition of the slave labor of the South with the free labor of the North. Many Northern grain-growers and manufacturers seem to think that emancipation would be of no pecuniary benefit to them; they say they supply the slaves with bread and clothing, and could do no more if they were free.—They forget that, as freemen, the wants as well as means of the negroes would be greatly increased. Man's wants are infinite, and increase with his ability to supply them.

He thought if it were not the duty of society or Government, it was obviously its interest to furnish employment to the laborer who cannot otherwise obtain it. He was a much better philanthropist who would use his efforts to *prevent* poverty and crime, than the man who should wait for an opportunity to relieve the pauper and reform the criminal. Mr. C. was in favor of giving the public lands of the United States to such poor people as might be disposed to settle them. A rural population was generally a conservative one, and the greater the number of land-holders, the better the citizens and the more strong the Government.

When Mr. Clay had concluded, Mr. Joseph B. Collins stated that the Asylum for Colored Orphans was erected at an expense of $20,000, which had been procured in donations by the exertions of a few ladies. It is located in Forty-second street, near the Croton Reservoir, and is capable of accommodating two hundred children. There are now one hundred and fifty in that Institution.

MORRIS FRANKLIN, Esq. made a few remarks in his usual nervous and earnest style, in which he paid a handsome tribute to Mr. Clay, and then offered the following resolution, which was adopted by acclamation:

"Resolved, That the thanks of the Managers of the Colored Orphan Asylum are due, and hereby tendered to the Hon. Cassius M. Clay, for his noble and disinterested effort to replenish the exhausted treasury of their Institution, and the eloquent appeal which he has made on behalf of those who are the objects of their care, and the grateful recipients of the public bounty."

A collection of $58 was taken up in addition to the amount received at the door.

TAKEN AT HIS WORD.

Sometime about the last of August as the cars were passing from New Bedford to Boston, a gentleman whose taste savored strongly of the "peculiar institution," happened to take his seat in a car without scrutinizing the features of all his fellow passengers. Judge, then, of his surprise and indignation, as he suddenly discovered that the car contained two passengers whose complexion was a shade or two darker than he fancied. Immediately upon this discovery, he turned upon the two *offenders*, and, with an air of insolence, demanded of them what business *they* had in the same car with white people, following up his inquiry with a volley of abuse. The older of the two colored gentlemen found it very difficult to prevent his younger companion from making any conversation with the offended gentleman, which he essayed to do on two or three occasions, as his blood evidently boiled under the abuse, but he was with some difficulty induced to allow the fastidious gentleman to spend his fury upon the air. Meantime the Conductor made his appearance, who had apparently made himself, by some means, acquainted with the state of affairs before having entered the car, in which the disturbance had occurred. As he approached the angry passenger, the first question proposed was, "Do you intend to treat colored people the same as you do white people in these cars?" "Yes," was the calm reply, "if they behave the same; and if they should behave badly, we should use them just as we shall you." The passenger then "freed his mind" to the Conductor, and ended by saying that "he would leave the cars—he would'nt ride in the same car with niggers." "As you please, Sir," says the Conductor. "Here, Mr. Brakeman, just lend us a hand here, and we will set this man out." No sooner said than done; the Conductor and Brakeman assisted the brawler to alight, and greatly to the satisfaction of the passengers, who seemed to care more for the conduct than for the complexion of their fellow passengers. The cars passed on.

THE RIGHTS OF THE FREE STATES SUBVERTED,

Or, an enumeration of some of the most prominent instances in which the Federal Constitution has been violated by our National Government, for the benefit of Slavery. By a member of Congress.

INTRODUCTION.

Perhaps no subject was ever more generally misunderstood than the contest now going on between a portion of the people of the free States and those who are attached to the slaveholding interests of the South. Until quite recently, the Southern doctrine, from the adoption of the Constitution, has been, that "*Slavery is strictly a State institution, over which the Federal Government has no control.*" This is believed by the people of the North, generally, to be the constitutional doctrine; those who dissent from it are so few that they can hardly be said to form an exception. That eminent statesman, Henry Clay, in 1844, declared that "the *existence, maintenance, and continuance of Slavery must depend entirely upon the power and authority of the States in which it exists.*"*

From this position few Northern men will dissent. All agree that Congress has no power to uphold it; and if the States in which it exists are unable to sustain it, it should be left to perish. Congress possesses no power to compel the people of the free States to uphold the Slavery of the South; neither has it any power to compel the slave States to abolish it. It cannot interfere for either purpose. Still, Southern politicians and Southern statesmen have so often reiterated the fact, that Northern men were endeavoring to interfere with their "*peculiar institution*," that many Northern statesmen yet seem to be unconscious that those who have said and done most in regard to the encroachments of Slavery, have merely endeavored to protect the rights of the free States, and to preserve the Constitution from being subverted. They have put forth their efforts to save the people of the North from being unconstitutionally involved in the expense and crime of supporting Slavery.

The most objectionable feature of our Constitution, is that provision which gives to the slave States a representation in Congress proportioned to the number of slaves which they hold. This was a *privilege* conceded to those States. By it they now have nineteen members of Congress more than they would be entitled to were freemen alone included in the ratio of representation. Yet these members, like the others, are bound by the Constitution, and possess no right to pervert the Government to the support of Slavery. Again: it is supposed by some, that that provision of the Constitution which relates to the arrest of fugitive slaves, directly involves the people of the free States in the support of Slavery. But under the construction which that clause has received, it appears that the whole power of Congress consists in prohibiting the people of the free States from interfering to prevent the master, or his agents, from arresting his fugitive slave. We may feed, and clothe, and lodge the slave, knowing him to be a fugitive. It seems that we may go farther: we may inform him of his rights, tell him how to escape, and furnish him with arms to defend himself, without making ourselves liable under the Constitution or laws of the United States. We may also refuse to feed, or to lodge the slaveholder while in pursuit of his slave; we may spurn him from our presence; and we may stand and see his slave defend himself, even to taking the master's life, and incur neither moral nor legal responsibility. Yet we may not secrete the slave from, nor defend him against, his master. So far as this supineness involves us in a negative support of Slavery, so far are we liable to maintain that institution. Again: it is urged by some that, so far as the Constitution makes it the duty of the Federal Government to suppress internal violence, it subjects the people of the free States to the support of Slavery. The duty of the Federal Government goes only so far as to *suppress the violence*. It takes no notice of Slavery. But if slaves commit violence in order to obtain their liberty, such violence must be suppressed. Yet, when the violence ceases, the power of the Government ceases. Our troops cannot go farther and deliver the insurgents to their masters, nor can they inquire whether they be masters or slaves. The business and duty of our troops is with the *violence*, and not with Slavery. But so far as the suppression of domestic violence tends to the support of Slavery, so far the people of the free States may constitutionally be compelled to support that institution. I make this explanation in order that I may be definitely understood. Taking this as the true construction of the Constitution, we must regard every exercise of the national influence for the purpose of sustaining Slavery, every payment of money from the national treasury, every employment of the navy or of the army for such purpose, as violations of that instrument.

It is intended in the following pages, to lay before the reader some of the most prominent instances in which the Federal Government have violated the Constitution, and trampled upon the rights of the free States, in order that Slavery might be upheld and protected. It is intended to confine the enumeration to *actual violations of the Constitution*, and to pass unnoticed all those attempts which have failed to wield the power and influence of the Government to that purpose. Nor is it intended to notice any of those instances in which an indirect support has been extended to that institution. In short, the object is to collect, within as short a space as may be convenient, only those prominent instances in which the Constitution has been trampled upon for the benefit of the slave interest, without embracing any of doubtful character, and without pretending to enumerate *all* of those which are not regarded as doubtful.

With these explanatory remarks, we will proceed to examine some of those instances in which our Federal compact has been violated—

By treaty stipulations.

On the 7th August, 1790, the United States concluded a treaty with the Creek Indians, in which they distinctly agreed to deliver up the negroes then residing within their territory, *to the officers of the United States*; and if not delivered on or before the first day of June following the date of the treaty, the Governor of Georgia was authorized to appoint three persons to repair to the Indian country to demand them. The negroes thus to be surrendered, had left their masters during the Revolutionary war and subsequently thereto; and the Federal Government now interposed its influence to get them back to their masters. For this and other stipulations on the part of the Indians, the United States agreed to pay them an annuity of fifteen hundred dollars, together with certain goods mentioned in the treaty.† This is believed to be the first instance in which the Federal Government was exerted to perpetuate Slavery instead of Liberty. By this treaty, the people of the free States were involved in the expense of restoring the fugitive slaves of Georgia, and from that day to the present time, they have been annually taxed to meet the stipulations of this treaty, and will continue to be taxed under these stipulations while we remain a nation, and the Creek Indians shall constitute an independent tribe.

But the Indians neglected to deliver the negroes; and on the 31st December, 1795, the Secretary of War communicated to the President the fact, that the Indians had disregarded their compact, in neglecting to deliver the slaves under the treaty of 1790, and advised that the slaves be paid for by the United States.‡

This communication was sent to the Senate and House of Representatives by the President on the 12th January following, but no final action appears to have taken place at that time. § On the 29th of June, 1796, another treaty was entered into between the United States and the Creek Indians, called "the treaty of Coleraine." By the terms of

* Vide Mr. Clay's letter to the editor of the Lexington Observer, Sept. 2, 1844. † Laws of the United States, 1 vol., 259—6th American State Papers, 81. ‡ 5 American State Papers, 546. § American State Papers, vol. 5, page 546.

this latter treaty, the Indians again covenanted to deliver up to the officers of the United States, such negroes as were resident in their nation; and if they were not delivered by the first day of January next following the date of the treaty, then the Governor of Georgia was authorized to appoint three persons to repair to the Creek nation and demand said negroes, *under direction of the President of the United States.** In consideration of this, and other stipulations, the United States covenanted to pay the Indians six thousand dollars in goods, and to furnish them with two blacksmiths and strikers, tools, &c. &c. Thus were the people of the free States again involved in the expense and disgrace of sustaining Slavery, for the sole benefit of the slaveholders of Georgia. It should also be understood, that at the conclusion of this treaty, many of the slaves from the "*Upper* Creek towns" were brought in and delivered to the officers of Government, who condescended to act with the Indians as the assistant catchpolls of Southern slaveholders.†

Thus were the people of the whole nation taxed and again dishonored for the benefit of an institution most palpably beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and abhorrent to the feelings of the people generally.

The slaves of Georgia, however, continued to flee from bondage, and to seek an asylum among the Indians; and many who had left prior to the treaty of 1790, remained in the Indian country, intermarried with the Seminoles, or "Southern Creeks," as they were then called, and became permanently incorporated with various bands known as the "Florida Indians."‡

The people and government of Georgia were constantly making efforts to get the United States to obtain a return of the slaves who were living with the Indians; but these efforts proved of little use, as the Indians neglected to restore any, if them.§ In 1802, a general law regulating intercourse between the people of the United States and the Indian tribes, was enacted by Congress. By the terms of this law, the agent for paying annuities was authorized to retain from the annuities of any tribe, the value of any property taken from the white people by Indians belonging to such tribe.‖ Under this law, it is said, that a compensation was retained by the agent of the United States, for all slaves who left their masters, and went to unite with the Indians, subsequent to the passage thereof. On this point the writer speaks from verbal information, and not from official documents. It is, however, certain, that the people of Georgia could neither get the negroes who had left their masters prior to the passage of the law, nor could they obtain compensation for their loss. They therefore became importunate in their demands upon the Federal Government, to interfere more effectually for the protection of Slavery in that State. The Executive finally determined to make another effort to aid the slaveholders of Georgia in obtaining their slaves, or to extort from the Indians a compensation for their loss.¶ To effect this object, arrangements were made by the Executive of the United States and the Executive of Georgia, for negotiating another treaty with the Indians; at the making of which, the State of Georgia should be represented by her authorized agents, in order that the claims of her slaveholders should be duly regarded.** Instructions were given to the Commissioners, who negotiated the treaty on the part of the United States, to lend to the agents of Georgia every aid that might tend to effect the object of their mission.††

The Commissioners on the part of the United States, and those on the part of Georgia, met the chiefs, warriors, and head men of the Creeks at "Indian Spring," about the 25th of December, 1821. On the 27th the Commissioners of Georgia delivered their talk to the Indians, in which they assured the Indians, that "*in order to keep the chain of friendship bright between the white and red people, it was necessary that they should do* JUSTICE TO EACH OTHER." They then reminded the Indians of their stipulation to return negroes, contained in the treaties of New-York and Coleraine, and delivered to the Indians a list of their claims.‡‡ The next day, Gen. McIntosh, principal chief, replied, that "he did not know that he was called here to answer for the claims of Georgia, until they had received the talk of the Commissioners yesterday—that most of the items he knew nothing about." That Gen. McGilvery, who negotiated the treaty of New-York more than thirty years before, when he returned, informed their people that they were to deliver up the negroes then in the nation: but they were not to be liable for any that were dead or removed. That many of them were collected at the time of the treaty of Coleraine, and delivered to the agent of the United States. That others were subsequently delivered to Colonel Hawkins, who never mentioned to them any claim under the treaty of Coleraine, but mentioned that of New-York. That many of the negroes had been carried away by the British at the close of the war; that in 1816, many of these negroes were in the fort on the Apalachicola river; that most of them were killed, and those that were not killed were delivered to Colonel Clinch—and many of the negroes had gone into Florida among the Seminoles. That he had himself, with his warriors, joined General Jackson's army, and gone with them into Florida, where they took some of those negroes, and delivered them to the agent of the United States, and that others still remained among the Seminoles.—That if the President admitted that country to belong to the Creeks, he would take his warriors and go and bring up as many as they could get, and deliver them up to the United States. He thought the Creeks had fairly complied with their treaties in good faith.§§

In reply to this, the Commissioners of Georgia insisted that the Indians ought to pay for the negroes carried away by the British at the close of the war, and for those among the Seminoles, "*and for the increase of all that had taken up their residence among the Indians.*" This demand was rejected by the Indians. It was, however, agreed to refer all the claims of Georgia against the Indians to the President,‖‖ and a stipulation was made in the treaty, by which the United States were to hold $250,000 due from the United States to the Indians, in trust for the payment of such claims as the President should regard just and proper.¶¶ The President took upon himself the discharge of thus estimating the value of the slaves, and the propriety of paying for their increase. Commissioners were appointed for that purpose, who, after full examination, estimated the amount that should be paid to the slaveholders of Georgia, in full of all demands, at $101,000. This sum, according to the report of Mr. Wirt, Attorney General of the United States, was made up by estimating the price of the negroes at two or three times their real value.*** This money being paid over to the owners of slaves, left in the hands of the Government $149,000 belonging to the Indians.—That amount was retained by Government for some years, until the owners of slaves having already received two or three times their real value, petitioned Congress to distribute the remaining sum among them as an additional compensation. Congress made the appropriation, and the money was paid to them, and the Indians were thus defrauded by the General Government of $149,000, in order to enrich the slaveholders of Georgia, in addition to paying two or three times the real value of the negroes.†††

---

* American State Papers, vol. 5, page 586. † Laws U. S. vol. 8, page 393 ‡ Vide 6 vol. American State Papers, page 252. § House Doc. 272 1st Sess. 24th Congress. ‖ 5 American State Papers, 249. ¶ Laws U. S. 2 vol. 360 ** 6 American State Papers, 257. †† American State Papers, 254 ‡‡ 6 American State Papers, 250, §§ 6 American State Papers, 251. ‖‖ 6 American State Papers, 252 ¶¶ American State Papers, 256. *** 6 American State Papers, 249. ††† Ex. Doc. 1st Ses. 26th Congress, vol. 6, No. 123. ‡‡‡ Laws U. S. 9 vol. 117.

(*To be continued.*)

From the New Bedford Mercury.

NEW BEDFORD LYCEUM.

To the Public.—By a vote of the New Bedford Lyceum, membership has been refused to several respectable colored people, and the North Gallery of Liberty Hall, where the lectures are given, assigned to them, where they are to be admitted free. The following letters from Messrs. Ralph W. Emerson and Charles Sumner are published with their consent, by the request of several members of the New Bedford Lyceum and others, who are desirous that the public should be informed how these gentlemen, in common with many other highly intelligent persons, regard the late measures of this institution, which have resulted in the virtual exclusion of colored people from the lectures as well as membership.

CONCORD, Nov. 17th, 1845.

W. J. ROTCH, Esq. Secretary:—

Dear Sir:—If I come to New Bedford, I should be ready to fix, say the first Tuesday of March, and the second. But I have to say, that I have indirectly received a report of some proceedings in your Lyceum, lately, which, by excluding others, I think ought to exclude me. My informant said, that the application of a colored person for membership by purchase of a ticket in the usual manner, had been rejected by a vote of the Lyceum; and this, for the first time. Now, as I think the Lyceum exists for popular education, as I work in it for that, and think that it should bribe and importune the humblest and most ignorant to come in, and exclude nobody, or, if anybody, certainly the most cultivated,—this vote quite embarrasses me, and I should not know how to speak to the company. Besides, in its direct counteraction to the obvious duty and sentiment of New England, and of all freemen in regard to the colored people, the vote appears so unkind, and so unlooked for, that I could not come with any pleasure before the Society.

If I am misinformed, will you—if they are printed—have the goodness to send me the proceedings; or, if not printed, their purport; and oblige,

Yours, respectfully,
R. W. EMERSON.

BOSTON, November 29, 1845.

My Dear Sir:—I have received your favor of November 24th, asking me to appoint an evening in February or March, on which to lecture, in pursuance of my promise, before the New Bedford Lyceum.

On receiving the invitation of your Lyceum, I felt flattered by the honor conferred on me, and, in undertaking, as I did, to deliver a lecture at some time to be appointed afterwards, I promised myself peculiar pleasure in an occasion of visiting a town, which I have never seen, but whose refined hospitality and liberal spirit, as they have been described to me, awaken my warmest interest.

Since then, I have seen in the public prints, a Protest, purporting to be signed by several gentlemen, well known to me by reputation, members of the Lyceum, and some of them a part of its government, from which it appears that, in past years, tickets of admission to the Lyceum were freely sold to colored persons, and that no objection was made to them as members; but that, at the present time, tickets are refused to colored persons, and membership of the Lyceum is also practically refused to them, though, by a special vote recently adopted, they are allowed to attend the lectures without expense, "provided they will sit in the North Gallery."

From these facts, it appears that the New Bedford Lyceum has recently undertaken to establish, within its jurisdiction, a distinction of *caste* which had not been there recognized before.

One of the cardinal truths, both of religion and freedom, is *the equality and brotherhood of man.* In the sight of God, and of all just institutions, the white man can claim no precedence or exclusive privilege from his color. It is "the accident of an accident" that places a human soul beneath the dark shelter of an African countenance, rather than beneath our colder complexion. Nor can I conceive any application of the benign injunction, do unto others as you would have them do unto you, more pertinent than to the white man, who founds a discrimination between his fellow-men on a difference of skin.

It is well known that the prejudice of color, which is akin to the stern and selfish spirit that holds a fellow-man in slavery, is peculiar to our country. All will remember the two youths of African blood, who gained the highest honors in the College at Paris, in the winter of 1838, and dined on the same day with the King of France, the descendant of St. Louis, and of Louis the Great, at the palace of the Tuileries. In Paris, I have sat for weeks, at the School of Law, on the same benches with colored persons, listening, like myself, to the learned lectures of Degerando, and of Rossi; nor do I remember observing, in the throng of sensitive young men by whom they were surrounded, any feeling towards them except of companionship and respect. In Italy, at the Convent of Palezzuola, on the shores of the Alban Lake, and on the site of the ancient Alba Longa, I have seen for several days a native of Abyssinia, only recently conducted from his torrid home, and ignorant of the language that was spoken about him, yet mingling with the Franciscan Friars, whose guest he was, in delightful and affectionate familiarity. In these examples may be discerned the proper influence of the Christian spirit.

In lecturing before a society, which has embodied the prejudice of color among its laws, and thus formally reversed an injunction of the highest religion and politics, I might seem to lend my sanction to what is most alien to my soul, and to join with them in disobedience to that command which teaches us to regard as all of one blood: all the children of the earth,

"Quamvis ille niger, quamvis tu candidus esses!"

I cannot do this.

I beg leave, therefore, to be excused at present from appointing a day on which to lecture before your Lyceum, and I pray you to lay this letter before the Lyceum, that they may understand the grounds on which I deem it my duty to decline the honor of appearing before them.

I hope you will pardon the frankness of this communication, and believe me,

My dear Sir,
Very faithfully, yours,
CHARLES SUMNER.

W. J. ROTCH, Esq.
of the Committee of Arrangements of the New Bedford Lyceum.

From the North American Review.

THE OREGON QUESTION.

The readers of Guy Mannering probably remember Dandie Dinmont's famous lawsuit with his neighbor Jack o'Dawston Cleugh, about the "marches," or boundaries of the good farm of Charlies-hope. But for the benefit of those who have not read the passage, or who may have forgotten it, we subjoin Dandie's own account of the dispute, together with counsellor Pleydell's excellent advice on the occasion.

"'We're at the auld work of the marches again, Jack o'Dawston Cleugh and me. Ye see we march on the tap o'Touthop-rigg after we pass the Pomoragrains; for the Pomoragrains, and Slackenspool, and Bloodylaws, they come in there, and they belang to Peel! but after ye pass Pomoragrains, at a muckle great saucer-headed, cauliugged stane, that they ca' Charlies Chuckie, there Dawston Cleugh and Charlies-hope, they march. Now, I say, the march rins on the tap o' the hill, where the wind and water shears, that Jack o' Dawston Cleugh again, he contrevenes that, and says that it hauds down by the auld drove road that gaes awa' by the Knot of the Gate ower to Keeldarward,—and that makes an unco difference."

"'And what difference does it make, friend? How many sheep will it feed?'

"'Oa, no many,—it's lying high and exposed,—it may feed a hog, or aiblins twa in a good year.'

"'And for this grazing, which may be worth about five shillings a year, you are willing to throw away a hundred pounds or two?'

"'Na, sir, it's no for the value of the grass, it's for justice.'

"'My good friend, justice, like charity, should begin at home. Do you justice to your wife and family, and think no more about the matter.'

"Diamont still lingered, twisting his hat in his hand; 'It's no for that, sir,—but I would like ill to be bragged wi' him,—he threeps he'll bring a score o' witnes-es and mair,—and I'm sure there's as mony will swear for me as for him, folk that lived a' their days upon the Charlies-hope, and wad na like to see the land lose its right.'

"'Zounds, man, if it be a point of honor, why don't your landlords take it up?'

"'I dinna ken, sir, (scratching his head,) there's been nae election dusts lately, and the lairds are unco neighborly, and Jock and I canna get them to yoke thegither about it, a' that we can say,—but if ye thought we might keep up the rent'——

"'No! no! that will never do,—confound you, why don't you take good cudgels and settle it?'

"'Odd, sir, we tried that three times already,—that's twice on the land, and ance at Locherbye fair. But I dinna ken,—we're baith good at singlestick, and it could nae weel be judged.'

"'Then take broadswords, and be damned to you, as your fathers did before you.'

"'Aweel, sir, if ye think it wad na be again the law, it's a' ane to Dandie.'

"'Hold! hold! we shall have another Lord Soulis's mistake. Prythee, man, comprehend me; I wish you to consider how very trifling and foolish a lawsuit you wish to engage in.'

"'Ay, sir? So you wiana take on wi' me, I'm doubting?'

"'Me! not I,—go home, go home, take a pint and agree.'"

Two of the richest and most powerful nations in the world, England and the United States, are now just in the position of Dandie Dinmont, and his neighbor Jock, though the land in dispute between them is by no means of as great relative importance when compared with their other possessions. The territory of Oregon is not worth much; "it's lying high and exposed—it may feed a hog, or aiblins twa in a good year." It is separated from the one power by a broad ocean, and the intervention of a vast continent, and from the other by a desert two thousand miles broad, and a range of lofty and precipitous mountains. It has remained for half a century open to any wanderers who might see fit to establish themselves there, and run the risk of starvation. Yet, till within four or five years, it has been tenanted only by Indians, wolves, or bears, or by small companies of hunters and trappers, who go there to obtain furs, but not to found a home. England has found it worth her while to establish colonies at the antipodes; she is fast peopling Van Dieman's Land and New Zealand, but sends no emigrants to Oregon, though she had wrested from Spain, in 1790, by a threat of war, and by an armament of enormous cost, a right to make settlements there if she found it expedient. The same treaty stipulated that the whole coast should remain open for settlement by Spain also; but not one Spaniard thought fit to build a hut on the inhospitable shore. The United States succeeded by treaty to the rights of Spain, but almost equally dilatory in profiting by them. "The citizen of the United States in Oregon, previous to 1843," says Dr. Greenhow, "did not probably exceed four hundred in number." Within the last two years, indeed, a much larger number of our people, probably some three thousand, acting on a very extraordinary presumption, that a country, which two great nations were threatening to go to war about, must at least be fit to live in, have actually traversed the vast and barren *steppes* and mountain ranges, which separate Missouri from the Pacific Ocean, and have established themselves in that distant and unpromising region; though every one of them might have purchased an Illinoi farm of the finest land in the world, probably for less than what his journey has cost him.

From the Free-Labor Advocate.

THE LONDON COMMITTEE.

As I have given the readers of the Advocate no account of the proceedings of these distinguished men since they left the territory of Iowa, I doubt not but some further intelligence would be acceptable to many.

I am informed that when they left Iowa, they proceeded to Young's Prairie, in Michigan, taking Clearlake Monthly Meeting on their way, if I recollect right.

Taking, did I say? That is not precisely what I mean. They neither took the Monthly Meeting, nor attended it; but what I intended to say, is, that they took that opportunity to visit the Anti-Slavery Friends constituting that Monthly Meeting.

From Michigan I understand they proceeded to visit the Western Quarterly Meeting of "body Friends." And I suppose they have had "opportunities" with Anti-Slavery Friends in their different neighborhoods westward of this place, excepting, perhaps, one Monthly Meeting.

They still seem disposed to leave us of Newport meeting, till the last. Something over a week ago they were at Richmond, (where I hear Josiah Forster remains sick,) and then visited Anti-Slavery Friends, at Smyrna, whence they passed within a short distance of us, and the next we hear of them is from the different meetings constituting Springfield Monthly Meeting.

So far as I have learned, they pursue the same course everywhere; that is to read the "Address" from London Yearly Meeting, and then urge Anti-Slavery Friends to comply with the advice, to discontinue their own meetings and to attend the meetings for worship of those from whom they have withdrawn; positively refusing, on all occasions, to enter into an investigation of the cause which led to the separation, and confessing at the same time that they know little or nothing about those causes. In fact, William Forster told the deputation of Anti Slavery Friends, who visited them at Richmond, just after the Yearly Meeting there, that he had not read any of the publications on the subject; and that he did not feel a freedom to do so. Thus excluding all testimony on our side, while he obtained the opposite side of the question by hearing it read in the official communications of the body Friends to London Yearly Meeting and Meeting for Sufferings.

But to return. I have just received a statement, signed by two Anti-Slavery Friends, of undoubted veracity, of what took place at the interview at Nettle Creek; from which I make the following compilation.

After they had taken their seats a few minutes, George Stacy stated that the object in calling them together, was to read an expostulatory Address from London Yearly Meeting, to those who had believed it right to withdraw from Indiana Yearly Meeting, and set up separate meetings to themselves. It was then stated, on the part of Anti-Slavery Friends, that from the course they, the committee, had pursued hitherto, it was understood that their sole object was, to lay waste the religious society of Anti-Slavery Friends. To this they made no reply. They were plainly told that Anti-Slavery Friends felt called upon to watch upon the walls of their Zion, and to guard against the encroachments of the enemy; and they were requested to allow them the same privilege that Paul had, that is, to answer for themselves.

To this the committee partially consented.

The Address was then read. After which the committee made some remarks, censuring Anti-Slavery Friends, and justifying their opposers.

They were repeatedly asked if they had investigated the difficulty between us and those we had left. To which they gave no answer. But when they were told how one-sided they were in giving judgment before hearing both parties; they said they knew nothing of the cause of separation, and they had no privilege from their Yearly Meeting to investigate the difference between us; and they did not come here to discuss the matter, but were messengers to expostulate with us.

They were then replied to in regard to their great mission, as being messengers of the Lord; and told of their inconsistency, by alluding to their standing in regard to the Anti-Slavery cause in England, and the different course they took in America; how they had advised us, heretofore, to join with our fellow-countrymen in this great work, and how they now advise us to return to that body which had rejected that advice, and proscribed us for following it. One of the committee then said he wished to give some explanation in regard to the allusion that had been made to their being messengers of the Lord. He said they did not say, nor had they said, they were messengers of the Lord; they were only messengers of London Yearly Meeting, (in this he said truly,) and came here to carry the message from that meeting.

They contended that the different Yearly Meetings in America bore a faithful and consistent testimony against Slavery. They were then asked if they believed the Society of Friends in America, faithfully and consistently bore a testimony in favor of the anti-slavery cause in this country. To which George Stacy replied, that he was not fully acquainted with the character of the anti-slavery enterprise in this country; *it might be possible that it consisted of those who were infidels;* and *if* so they in England would advise against joining with such associations. He was then asked if he knew whether the anti-slavery associations in England were clear of all those who hold unsound principles? To which he made no reply. They were then told that "*it might be possible*" there were some, both in Europe and America, engaged in the anti-slavery cause, who were not sound in principle; and that it was *quite as possible* there were some in the Society of Friends who were not sound in principle. To all of which they made no reply. They should have been asked, which they considered the most dangerous associate, the anti-slavery infidel or the pro-slavery Christian. And further, I believe they might safely have been told, that the course they are pursuing, is better calculated to promote infidelity, than the conduct of all the anti-slavery infidels in christendom. I know this is a strong expression, and I say it with a heart full of grief, that I am compelled to believe it to be true. I deeply lament the spirit of infidelity that is prevailing to a considerable extent in our country, and I have no hope of its being arrested till the professors of Christianity manifest more consistency.

Various questions were put to them, and among others, whether it was consistent with our testimony against Slavery for Friends to vote for slaveholders? Which they refused to answer, though they were solicited to do so. They were then referred to the example of George Fox; how he answered all civil questions, investigated things, and never gave judgment without hearing both sides, &c.

Towards the conclusion, a friend proposed asking them a few more questions. One of them rose and said they should decline answering them. The questions, however, were put as follows:

1st. Do you know whether there is any difference between the Body Friends, and Anti-Slavery Friends?

2nd. Do you know whether the charges made by the old Yearly Meeting against Anti-Slavery Friends, are true or not?

3d. Do you know whether the charges made by Anti-Slavery Friends against the old Yearly Meeting, are true or not?

4th. Is it the duty of a Christian, when there are two parties, to ask one of them to submit to the other, without an investigation, to see which is in the wrong?

5th. Would it be right to ask others to do anything without giving all explanations, and answering all questions, so far as is in their power to give or answer, relating thereto?

I suppose when our English Friends answer all these questions to their own satisfaction, they will be ready to go home.

I am extremely reluctant to question the honesty of purpose by which these men are actuated, but if they are honest, they must be the dupes of a blind and bigoted sectarianism. I really pity them! Most ardently do I desire, if they are acting under a delusion, that their eyes may be opened to see the mischief they are doing the cause of Christianity; and if they are acting against light and knowledge, they they may be brought to a speedy repentance.

Communications.

Letter from Pennsylvania.

SCHUYLKILL, Chester Co. Pa. 5th Jan. 1846.

MR. GAY:—Ever since the American Anti-Slavery Society adopted the motto of "No union with slaveholders," the liberty party has been unceasing in its cry that we have "turned a somerset," "abandoned the old platform," &c. A few years ago, when the opponents of our cause were repeating the silly question, "What has the North to do with Slavery?" these persons, like the rest of us, met the inquiry by pointing triumphantly to those clauses of the Constitution which we now bring forward in support of our assertion, that, by continuing longer to uphold the existing compact, we involve ourselves in the guilt of sustaining Slavery. We have merely taken the position to which we were then irresistibly tending, and which their false relations prevent them from assuming. Not one of them had then ever thought of doubting that the North was fully pledged to support the South in quelling the insurrections of her slaves, and there are many of them, even now, who have not the hardihood to deny our liability except by resorting to the paltry trickery of mental reservation. Their course is a verification of the old adage, "*Necessity* is the mother of *invention.*"

Some of their discoveries are of a very remarkable character. They have found out, in the course of their researches, that the duty of returning fugitive slaves is not imposed by the Constitution at all, because that instrument speaks of persons only, and every one knows that slaveholders never designate slaves as persons; and that even if this expression does include slaves, the guilt of returning them does not rest upon any one in particular; but if upon any one, then, certainly, upon the non-voters, for they altogether refuse to have anything to do with the Government, and thus deprive themselves of all power to abolish this very objectionable clause which prevents us from declaring our soil sacred to freedom.

The whole gist of the matter turns out, at last, to be that they feel that our immeasurably higher position is a continual rebuke upon their own shortcomings, and that they have, for several reasons, an uncomfortable assurance that they will be left behind. Witness the repeated attempts of the advocates of the third party to prove that we are, in other ways, fully as guilty as themselves. They seem to think, forsooth, that because a certain non-voter chooses to pay duties on goods which he imports, (and which he has an undoubted right to import,) rather than permit our slaveholding Government to extort those duties from him, with additional advantages to the slave-power, and because a certain other non-voter uses slave-grown sugar in his tea, that they ought, certainly, to be permitted to drive a small trade in politics with impunity.

The anti-masonic party probably originated in pure motives, which is more than can be said of the Liberty party, (for we all remember that *it* was organized not so much to abolish Slavery, as to retrieve the falling fortunes of New Organization, which was, emphatically, "a gone case,") and yet we see that the last gasp of anti-masonry, in Pennsylvania, at least, was in giving its vote for an adhering mason. May we not rightfully anticipate a similar end for Liberty party? Though we should not be forward in predicting evil, it is unwise to refuse to be enlightened by the history of the past. The advocates of the third party here, have been forward in deprecating the introduction among us of what they term the "Eastern controversies,"—as if the true anti-slavery movement were not unitary, and as if sympathy, in just this one case, were to be limited by State lines. We find, nevertheless, that they do not scruple to enter into these very controversies to justify open betrayal of the cause, merely objecting to all discussion, but on one side. They seem to agree with Falstaff in the opinion that "the better part of valor is—discretion," in which quality they excel, and evidently unite with the same worthy in a fortunate determination not to "give a reason upon compulsion." The tendency of third party is certainly conservative. Since the disaffection of such of its advocates as were formerly friendly to the American Society, there has been a decided declension in their desire to have the churches thoroughly probed,—a declension which cannot be attributed to any other cause than their connection with the third party. I do not say that the feeling is universal, but its existence is indisputable, and is a striking comment upon the influence which that party exerts.

One of the most cunning strokes in the policy of the Liberty party here, has been to nominate Abolitionists who had taken no part whatever in favor of their scheme. This was a direct appeal to self, which some could not withstand, and they accordingly, by degrees, became, to some degree, identified with the party. Others, however, promptly rejected the honors in store for them, being content with the rewards of self-respect, and a clear conscience. Some of the former class are at a great loss to perceive "why we cannot all labor harmoniously together, each in his own way." They might as well wonder why the Abolitionists have never compounded with the colonizationists. It seems impossible to them to conceive how one can refuse co-operation with a movement which he thinks prejudicial to the cause of the slave, without being actuated by personal animosity toward its supporters. Some of them undoubtedly wish well to the Anti-Slavery cause, but let us beware of stifling the honest utterance of our own hearts, on account of their timidity.

H. W. G.

"Organic Sin."

In the New-York Evangelist, of December 25th, we have Mr. Beecher's definition of organic sin, by which it appears he has been misunderstood, and, consequently, misrepresented.

The question now to be considered is, whether this distinction between organic and individual sins, according to Mr. B.'s own definition of it, is adequate to the purpose for which it was suggested. Will it justify the Christian Church in holding religious fellowship with slaveholders? Mr. B. remarks: "The foundation of all that I have said as to the difference between an organic sin, and others merely individual, is the legal relation of master to slave, a relation created by the laws of the body politic, and which the master cannot dissolve by his own act;" &c. "If there is such a relation, and the community will not dissolve it, and the master cannot, then he can remain a slaveholder and not sin, because he remains so against his will." "In every case where the *legal relation* is voluntarily and deliberately continued, both parties are guilty of keeping a human being under a system essentially oppressive, unjust, and ruinous."

Now the question is, what is the actual position of the great body of slaveholders, with whom the Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist churches are holding fellowship? Do they really occupy the position which, according to Mr. B.'s definition of organic sin, they must occupy, in order to be innocent of this great transgression "of keeping a human being under a system essentially oppressive, unjust, and ruinous?" Are they slaveholders against their will? Have they mentally and heartily dissolved this "oppressive and unjust" relationship? Do they treat those who are legally slaves, as much like freemen as the laws will allow, in respect to remuneration for toil as well as in respect to general treatment? Do they perform their "whole duty to secure the repeal of laws so tyrannical and unjust," which Mr. B. allows that they must do to be clear of guilt? Have they done all that they can to dissolve the legal relation? Can they not dissolve that unjust relation by removing to another State, where their injured fellow-men may enjoy their inalienable right of liberty?

Of what avail is this ingenious distinction between organic and individual sins, unless these queries can be answered affirmatively? And who is there so biased as not to perceive that the affirmative answer would be a gross and palpable violation of truth and fact? Was not the conclusion of our respected brother Hawes, of Connecticut, that this distinction is one "of great value," premature? Certainly, Mr. B.'s definition of organic sins, closes the door of this subterfuge to the great mass of slaveholding professors with whom the churches are holding fellowship, and leaves them under the guilt of *individual* sins, and the churches, after all, under the guilt of covering sin by holding religious fellowship with men who "are guilty of the sin of keeping a human being under a system essentially oppressive, unjust, and ruinous."

The plaster will not cover the sore. The bed is too short for a man to stretch himself upon. Out of his own mouth, and by his own pen, is Mr. B. condemned for his present position in respect to his connection with the Presbyterian Church. By his own showing, that church has deliberately determined to hold religious communion with men who are guilty of individual sins of an "oppressive" and "unjust" character, and of "ruinous" tendency. By his continued fellowship with a church which is thus sanctioning the unfruitful works of darkness, he is practically nullifying his true and excellent testimony against the great sin of Slavery. If the voluntary, continued, practical sustaining of "a system essentially *oppressive, unjust,* and ruinous," does not disqualify men for a participation in that kingdom which "is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit," I should like Mr. B. to inform us what can disqualify men for that holy privilege. If the solemn command of the Holy One, "Come out from among them and be ye separate," is inapplicable to those who are voluntarily, practically sustaining such a system of gross immorality, as Mr. B. himself declares American Slavery to be, to whom, I ask, will this imperative mandate of the Almighty apply? If the Presbyterian Church deliberately determined to hold religious fellowship with sheep-stealers, would not Mr. B. come out from among them? Yet how much better is a man than a sheep? What is the crime of robbing a man of the value of a sheep, compared with the crime of robbing a man of his liberty, and of all his inalienable rights? To his very intelligent mind, and to his generous heart, these few imperfect considerations are respectfully submitted.

HENRY GREW.

Western New-York Anti-Slavery Society.

This Society held its third anniversary in Monroe Hall, Rochester, on Tuesday and Wednesday, 30th and 31st ultimo, for the purpose of reviewing its action and influence in the preceeding year, and taking into consideration the means to be adopted for the spread of Anti-Slavery truth, and the deliverance of the slave, for the year to come.

At an early hour, the hall was well filled with a respectable audience. Several very able speakers were present, among them were Joseph C. Hathaway, James Cannings Fuller, John W. Horn, Esq. G. B. Stebbins, of Massabhusetts, Lindley M. Moore, Samuel D. Porter Esq. Griffith M. Cooper, and W. W. Brown (the fugitive slave.) A committee was appointed to prepare business for the meeting, in the absence of the business committee. A committee was appointed to nominate officers for the ensuing year. The committee on nominations reported the following list:

For President, J. C. Hathaway, of Farmington. Vice Presidents, Isaac Post, of Rochester; Pliny Sexton, Palmyra; G. M. Cooper, Williamson, Sampson Robins, Lockport. General Agent and Corresponding Secretary, William W. Brown. Recording Secretary, Sarah A. Bartis. Treasurer, H. Bush.

The Committee reported the following resolutions, which, after several very animated speeches, especially from that distinguished speaker, John W. Horn, Esq. were adopted:

Resolved, That in our efforts to bring about a day of deliverance to the captive, we rely upon the power of truth, spoken in *love*, and yet, without concealment or compromise, as mightier than any other means, to modify and change the pro-slavery sentiment of the people.

Resolved, That in this dark hour of the nation's history, when the Representatives of the people have just consummated a dark deed, by which Slavery, with all its terrible cruelties and insults to our common humanity, has been strengthened and protected in a still wider area, it becomes the friends of the captive, the advocates of the inalienable rights of man, to be firm and unshaken in the advance of our high and noble cause, and to go onward, strengthened by a consciousness of right.

Resolved, That the property qualification, required of colored voters, is unreasonable, unjustifiable, and unnecessary; and that it is hypocritical for the people of this State to complain of oppression in foreign lands, while they are tolerating an invidious constitutional distinction in regard to the elective franchise.

Resolved, That it is the duty of every friend of humanity, and equal rights, to vote only for those delegates, irrespective of party, who are in favor of extending to the colored people of this State the same privileges as those enjoyed by the white man.

Resolved, That so long as the churches of this land use their influence to sanction and sanctify the ways of the aggressor, as is now the case, with but few exceptions, it is the duty of all true friends of humanity to give no fellowship or support to them, but to endeavor steadily and earnestly to reform them, and make them worthy the confidence of man.

Resolved, That the encroachment of the slave power in the Government, is calculated to make slaves of the Northern people.

Whereas, The political union between the North and South, based upon the United States Constitution, with its "solemn guarantees to Slavery," as Daniel Webster calls them, involves the whole people in the guilt of slaveholding, since, without the aid of the North the South could not hold its slaves in bondage; and whereas, the ecclesiastical union and fellowship, direct or indirect, between the Northern and Southern churches, is the great bulwark of Slavery; therefore,

Resolved, That the earnest effort of every true friend of the slave should be given to bring about a dissolution of union, political and ecclesiastical, with slaveholders.

Resolved, That Charles T. Torrey, now pining away in a Southern dungeon; and others incarcerated in prisons, in this so-called free country, guilty of no crime, but simply accused of aiding the oppressed to go free, demand our ready aid, and warmest sympathies, as sufferers in the cause of righteousness.

The resolution in favor of dissolving our connection with slaveholders, occupied most of the time of the convention. However, very good feeling existed during the whole of the discussion, and at a late hour on Wednesday, after a session of two days, the meeting adjourned sine die.

JOSEPH C. HATHAWAY, President.
WILLIAM W. BROWN, SARAH A. BURTIS, } Secretaries.

On Thursday, January 1st, a meeting of the Executive Committee was held, for the purpose of doing business for the Society. Among other business, they resolved to raise the sum of one thousand dollars during the present year, to be expended in spreading Anti-Slavery truth throughout Western New-York, and a committee, consisting of the following gentlemen, were appointed to carry out the wishes of the Society:

Finance Committee—Griffith M. Cooper, of Williamson; Pliny Sexton, Palmyra; and Isaac Post, of Rochester.

A majority of the Ladies' Sewing Circle being present, they resolved to hold a Fair, to be held during the holydays, a year from this time.

There appeared to be more of a determination on the part of the Executive Committee to do something, than at any preceding meeting, especially by the females. Those devoted friends of the slave, are determined that their Fair shall be second to none, save the great Boston Fair.

A great exertion will be made during the present year to extend the circulation of the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

B.

Rochester, N. Y. Jan. 8, 1846.

Old Colony Anti-Slavery Society.

A quarterly meeting of the Plymouth County A. S. Society was holden in the Universalist meeting-house, in Hanson, on Wednesday, January 7th, 1846. The President of the Society, Reverend Elmer Hewitt, occupied the chair. Notwithstanding the very severe rain, quite a goodly number of the "brave and true" were present; thus proving to the world that, with them, Anti-Slavery, old organized Anti-Slavery, is not a mere profession, a fiction, but a reality; and has energy of a life-giving character. Plymouth, Hanover, Kingston, Hanson, and Pembroke were represented.

The meeting being opened, Mr. Joshua Perry, of Hanson, offered the following preamble and resolutions, viz:

Whereas, slaveholders and their apologists often appeal to the Bible for examples and commands for holding men as goods personal, not recognizing the Bible distinction between the Jews' religion and Christianity; the former containing the examples and commands for slaveholding, being based upon the flesh, that is, the carnal heart, from which nothing good can proceed—the latter, being based upon the spirit, from which all good proceeds, containing no examples and commands for slaveholding; therefore,

Resolved, That neither the Jews' religion, nor the examples of Jewish worthies, is any good evidence or authority for holding men as chattels personal; but, on the contrary, as the Jewish religion was a carnal religion in all its developments, is proof inferential, that it is morally wrong to hold men as chattels personal.

Resolved, That those Abolitionists, who attempted to reply to the Reverend Governor Pinney's Bible argument for slave owning, at the New England Convention, in May last, should have taken the Bible position, that the Sinai covenant was a covenant of bondage, and, like Hagar and her son, is to be cast out; and to appeal to the law that came by Moses is to be infidel, as the Jews are, to the principles of grace and truth.

Mr. Perry advocated the above preamble and resolutions, in a speech of some length. They were also spoken to by Mr. S. Reed, of East Abington.

C. C. Burleigh being present, offered the following resolution as a substitute:

Resolved, That while we do not believe that either the Jewish or Christian Scriptures contain any warrant for holding man as property, we do not admit that the authority of any book or record can justify that act, since it is wrong in its own nature; and no rule or authority which attempts to justify it can be in accordance with the will of a God of truth and right.

Mr. Burleigh spoke at great length, and with great eloquence, in support of the above resolution. He considered this subject of importance, inasmuch as slaveholders appeal to the Jewish scriptures for the divine right of slaveholding. He would take this weapon out of their hands. He maintained that man should be the sole judge himself of what is right and wrong. He would not receive any written document, however sacred or high its authority, as absolutely right, without first bringing it to the test of the spirit or light within him. He was willing to receive the Bible, or any other written parchment, as the representative of truth and right, but not as absolute right or authority. Of all the books in the universe, as the representative of truth and right, he considered the Bible to stand first, and he would rather see all the books in the wide world destroyed than this.

Between Mr. Burleigh and Mr. Perry, an interesting discussion was carried on, to the edification of all present.

At the suggestion of Mr. Samuel Reed, of East Abington, a member of the Congregational church in that place, Mr. Burleigh offered the following resolutions, viz:

Resolved, That the barrenness of the churches, the fewness and limited extent of revivals of religion, of which the various religious sects of the day complain, are in our opinion a natural result of the want of true life in the religion of the churches.

Resolved, That the so-called revivals of a religion which holds fellowship with Slavery, would be a curse rather than a blessing to mankind, and would delay rather than hasten the universal triumph of pure Christianity.

The resolutions, after being discussed by C. C. Burleigh, Mr. Reed, and others, in the affirmative, were unanimously adopted.

On motion of E. Y. Perry, of Pembroke, voted that the next quarterly meeting of the Society be holden on the day of the annual fast, in April next.

On motion of S. Reed, the preamble and resolutions offered by J. Perry, touching the Bible, and the substitute offered by C. C. Burleigh, were laid upon the table.

The presence of Mr. Burleigh added much to the interest of the meeting. Notwithstanding the tremendous rain, the meeting of the Society was quite interesting. At 4 o'clock, P.M. the Society adj

No wonder, though you shrunk from entering it, were it the field of slaughter. But having your feet "shod with the preparation of peace"—the strong determination, never to shed blood, though your own were the sacrifice to that determination, you shall be at once lifted above all those hesitations, and doubts, and terrors of civil commotion, which are the smothered voice of the highest human reason, testifying that man has no right to *enforce* even justice and morality.

With so arduous and noble a field before them, how *can* men hesitate? God forgive the Abolitionists, if they have ever yielded to the strong temptation to despise the meanness of soul that gives back;—to repent them that they ever stirred to honorable action the craven spirits that, knowing what is right, expend more effort in attempting a half-way between right and wrong, than would suffice to bear them bravely onward in all honesty and truth.

There are certain modes of operation which, though not wrong in themselves, soon may become practically so, by the temptation which their narrowness of prescriptions offers to the inexperienced, the ill-informed, the timid, and the half-hearted. They may, in fact, be properly called half-way houses between anti-slavery and pro-slavery. Such was the Latimer movement, so called, in Massachusetts. "WE WISH DISTINCTLY TO BE UNDERSTOOD, THAT WE WAR NOT NOW WITH SLAVERY AT THE SOUTH, BUT WITH SLAVERY HERE AT THE NORTH. LOOK OUT FOR YOUR OWN LIBERTIES, MEN OF MASSACHUSETTS;" WAS THE EMPHATIC, SELF DEFEATING DEFINITION OF THAT MOVEMENT. We have no quarrel with boundaries or definitions; but the nature of this case forbids the supposition that geography could take the lead of morality;—that Mason & Dixon's could be the true line to draw. This matter lies, primarily, in the *spiritual* kingdoms, and its boundary should be the whole breadth of the differences between the Abolitionist and the slaveholder;—between Slavery and freedom plant the standard of absolute right on this question,—that of open, uncompromising demand, against the world, for immediate emancipation, even against the very South, that strongest citadel of Slavery, taking the chance of who shall throng around it,—this is the way and the only right way. Immediately withdraw your sanction, and support, and participation, from the wicked, the civil, and political, and ecclesiastical institutions of this country. Can you expect, preach as you may, that men will cease to make these the bulwarks of the slave system, while they have your practical co-operation in the deed? Your bad example more than nullifies your good precepts. You are like a house divided against itself.

Similar in intent, though less specific in its announcements, was the recent Anti-Texan movement in Massachusetts and elsewhere. It was sincere, though feeble in its endeavors; feeble, because so shallow in its apprehension of the case, and so circumscribed in its objects. This last consideration would have been of no consequence had the whole Committee been, like Garrison and W. Phillips, and some others, actually engaged, in a stronger capacity, as the foes of Slavery, for her own wickedness, and not merely with Slavery as a means of political domination over the white man of the North. But that Committee, as a body, became, of necessity, non-extant with the annexation of Texas. IT HAD, alas! no REAL cause for longer existence. The time has come for sterner work than mass-petitioning. The weapons for the Anti-Slavery warfare are not now paste-brushes nor ballot-boxes. Pro-Slavery herself will wield these, under the influence of the immediate and individual dissolution of each man's union with Slavery, as experience has shown us, during the few recent years. What is Third party—the best of it, we mean—what are Latimer and Texan Committees—what are Unitarian protests—what are Methodist secessions? The natural fruit of the action of the American Anti-Slavery Society and its individual pioneers.

"Third party" is scattered "like a thousand sheep upon ten thousand hills," (as a similar catastrophe in the New England portion of the Society of Friends was once described); and the Anti-Texan movement is no more. Still the nature of man is social; still union is felt to be strength; still concert of action is the dictate of common sense; still the powers of ten men are quite incalculably more effective when combined, than ten times the power of a single man. Now, then, is the time to present the claims of the plan of the American Anti-Slavery Society to the consideration of men. It is no mere *Seyes-Constitution*, yet, as the French politicians say, to be put *en mise*. It has been working twelve years, and its operations have been blessed with that success which leaves its ultimate triumph no matter of doubtful experiment. The principles, the measures, the men, the association that are identified with the slave and in opposition to the master, must have been, of course, calumniated, vilified, and misrepresented, during all these years of preparatory labor.

Now that calumny is so far conquered that men begin to suspect that they *may* have been duped by her,—now that pretence and hypocrisy are so far exposed that reality can be heard in contradistinction from them,—now that treachery is measurably unmasked, and dishonesty understood, is the time to point the sincere lover of freedom to a means whereby he can, by association, multiply, past calculation, the efficiency of the means he possesses for her service, while he strengthens his individualism in the very act of helping and being helped by others.—C.

Liberty Party and the Church.

"Several are giving up the Emancipator, because they think that so long as Liberty men, and editors, and publishers, belong to the present organized churches, no good will be done."

So writes a faithful friend and brother in one of the southern counties of Massachusetts. It excites in us no feeling of unkindness, but of regret. If this is so, if this conviction prevails, we see not how there can ever be any general co-operation for the abolition of Slavery. The laws of my country, and the laws of my Maker, alike guarantee to me the right of worshipping and serving God according to the dictates of my own conscience. These dictates make me a sincere and humble member of a Congregational Church. In that church, my recognized duties are, to do all that I can to make that church, and every individual member of it, as good as possible; and this, God helping me, I mean to do, faithfully, and without wavering. I see no end to that duty but the end of life. If I cannot obey my God in the service of the Liberty party, I shall consider myself discharged from that service—not at all, however, from the solemn pledge still to do all that is lawfully in my power for the abolition of Slavery.

This is from the Emancipator, the principal organ of the Liberty party. That even "several" of that party have come to the conclusion that they must abandon the pro-slavery church before any good can be done, we are glad to know, but the fact that a few are now taking this position, is unequivocal proof of what we have often asserted, and which has been as often denied. A hypocritical friend is worse than an open enemy. A class of persons professing hostility to Slavery, and yet building up and sustaining its confessedly strongest bulwark, are in reality the best friends of the institution, and the most insidious foes of freedom. To "come out" from the support of Slavery with these people, means only to "come out" politically. The pro-slavery Whig and Democratic parties are too wicked for anti-slavery politicians, but the pro-slavery church is good enough for anti-slavery Christians. In other words, the Liberty party requires that political parties shall be better than the Church; the member of the Legislature must have a higher Christian character than the member of the Church; the constable or hog-reeve must be a better man than the deacon; the man who surveys the highways must be of sounder morality than is required of him who shows the way of salvation; the ballot-box must be kept purer than the communion cup; the Hall of legislation *must not* become "a den of thieves," but Liberty party has no scourge for them who make such of the Temple of the Father; in short, the standard of morality and Christianity, in the political arena, is higher than at the altar of the Church of Christ. This is Liberty party doctrine in Massachusetts, now, and always has been. The position of Western Liberty party men has been pretty much the same, but some excuse has been found for them in the fact that the pro-slavery character of the Church has not been so generally or so faithfully exposed among them. They understand their relation to the Church, and are determined, apparently, to take their stand by the brethren of Massachusetts. In their recent State Convention, some objections were made to the nomination of Samuel Lewis, as the candidate for Governor, because of his connection with a pro-slavery church. The objection, however, was overruled, the Convention thinking they had no right to intermeddle with any man's church relations. The doctrine of the Philanthropist is that the Liberty party is simply a political party, and has no further mission. This seemed to be the sentiment of the State Convention, and on this ground the Liberty party everywhere, with few exceptions, seems disposed to rally. Let us hear no more, then, of the cant of Bible politics.

Mr. Clay at the North.

C. M. Clay's Northern visit has been a triumph to him, and will be a confusion to his enemies. He has been hailed by the people and the press everywhere as a true champion, except by such miscreant papers as the New-York Democratic Globe, and the Whig Courier & Enquirer. On our first page is a report of the meeting of the Colored Orphan Asylum, from the Tribune. Since it was printed, I have learned that it omitted the most essential feature of the evening. If the Tribune despises pro-slavery, and loves the cause of the slave as much as it professes, it should be above giving such a report as this of a meeting which, if my information be correct, was very contemptible in its character. Mr. Hiram Ketchum, it seems, in introducing Mr. Clay, declared at considerable length, that the Asylum had no opinion to express in regard to Slavery,—that with the exciting topics of the day it had no concern. I do not pretend to give the words of Mr. Ketchum, but the tenor of his remarks was of such a character as to exceedingly trammel Mr. Clay, and to place—by their own choosing—the Asylum in a most contemptible position. Of course we do not ask of such an Institution that it become actively engaged against Slavery, though by so doing it would strike at the root of the necessity of a separate Asylum for colored children, but we have a right, at least, to demand of it that if it will not step out of what it deems its sphere on the one hand, that then it shall mind its own business in every respect. It has no right, even in the lowest view of the subject, to give the weight of its influence in favor of Slavery, as it evidently does by the remarks of its mouthpiece on Tuesday evening. Of its course towards Mr. Clay, we have little to say, as that is a matter rather between him and them. But to our thinking, it is nothing more nor less than a very contemptible insult to invite him to speak before their Association, because they knew his name and fame would draw a crowded house, and fill their pockets, and then trammel him, and shut his mouth on the very subject which had given to him name and fame, and enabled them to make money out of him. Hiram Ketchum should have repelled with disgust any attempt to make him do such paltry business, and the Tribune should be ashamed to say anything of such a meeting, but to tell the truth of it. Out upon this Northern pro-slavery! Aside from its desperate wickedness, there is nothing on the earth, or under it, so despicably mean.

But I meant only to say a word to introduce the following letter from Mr. Clay to a number of gentlemen in Albany, who invited him to speak there. The letter to him was signed by very many of the members of the Assembly, and very many more would have signed it, had there been time:

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 16, 1846.

GENTLEMEN:—I have received, since my arrival here, your highly flattering letter, inviting me to address you and other distinguished Americans in Albany.

The purpose I had in view on leaving home, has been accomplished, and many reasons of a private nature urge my return to Kentucky, where I hope also to be best able to perform those duties which every citizen owes his own State first, and the General Government next.

I have before me now, in addition to your invitation, requests from many of the most distinguished men of Boston, of Brooklyn, of New-Haven, and other places in the free States, and from Wilmington and Baltimore in the slave States, for me to address them also, so that as there seems to be no limit to these flattering evidences of public confidence and sympathy, I must break away at once.

This request on the part of sixty-two American citizens so distinguished, encourages me to hope that the true issue between Liberty and Slavery is beginning to be understood and felt—that Slavery is indeed "an institution affecting deeply, for weal or for woe, all portions of our common country."

If labor be the basis of the rights of property, Slavery violated that law.

If justice, and virtue, and intelligence are the foundations of permanent Liberty, Slavery saps them!

If Constitutional Republicanism be the only guaranty of national freedom, Slavery has utterly trampled it under foot!

If they are not freemen who tamely submit to the loss of one right, then are the American people slaves!

This is the doctrine of '76, and the law of common sense.

When Northern citizens are imprisoned, and *habeas corpus* denied, and Northern ambassadors ignominiously driven away from seeking redress under the national judicature;

When Northern citizens are torn from their own once free soil and hurried by force into Southern dungeons;

When Northern citizens are hung in the South without a trial by a jury of their peers, and without having violated any law, for the freedom of speech;

When Northern blood and Northern treasure are expended for the acquisition of slave territory destined to increase the capabilities of oppression;

When Slave-Texas has about four representatives to one among the free—thus trampling under foot the revolutionary doctrine, that taxation and representation should be co-ordinate;

Who shall be so base as to ask any more in servile tones, "What has the North to do with Slavery?"

The liberty of the Press in the South is gone to-day! Will it live in the North to-morrow?

By Heavens, this is no longer a question about Africans—whether they be beasts or men?—a debate about maudlin philanthropy!—*but whether we, the eighteen millions of white men of these States, shall be freemen or slaves!*

Know, Americans, that the sword and the chain enter not the flesh till the spirit—ay, the spirit—of a people is dead!

Heaven help us to feel, to see, to dare—now—to-day—"Awake, arise, or be forever fallen!"

Pardon the warmth of my language, for I and mine are in chains, and silence is a crime! My constitutional rights are borne down by violence and perverted judicial decision, and remembering that we were once free, we must vindicate them, or die!

I have the honor to be,

Your obedient servant, C. M. CLAY.

To Messrs. *Wm. C. Bloss, E. W. Chester, J. Miller, &c.*

Mexico—Another Revolution.

A Mexican schooner at New-Orleans, from Tampico, brings intelligence of a Revolution begun, and, up to the time of her sailing—the 1st instant—peacefully and successfully consummated. It commenced with the "Army of Reserve," stationed at San-Luis Potosi. On the 14th December, the Commandant General, Romero, invited to his residence all the principal officers of the army, and read to them a manifesto in which the duty of the armed force is pointed out, and the political evils assigned, by which the Revolution is justified. Inefficiency in the general action of the Government, and especially a cowardly and dishonorable submission to the ambitious designs of the United States, in preventing repeatedly the army from marching upon Texas, and in admitting a Plenipotentiary of the United States to enter the capital with the avowed purpose of bargaining for the independence and nationality of the Republic, are the chief charges against the then existing Government.

This solemn act of the army was approved by the Governor and Assembly of the Department of San Luis Potosi, and a Committee of general officers waited upon General Paredes, and setting forth the desperate situation of the country, called on him to save it. The General acceded to their demands, and is said to have commenced a march upon the city of Mexico at the head of an army of six thousand men.

This news again throws us into uncertainty as to a war with Mexico. A Revolution, predicated upon hostility to the United States, if successful, would seem to pledge the party that shall then be in power to make good their words by a declaration of war. It is useless, however, to indulge in any surmises when there is so little on which to found any rational prediction; but it seems not unlikely that we have not seen the end of immediate trouble brought upon the country by the Annexation iniquity.

One thing, at least, seems certain. "Young America" has received a check in spreading, after her fashion, the blessings of liberty and republicanism over still other portions of the Mexican Provinces. If Mexico will not go to war with the United States for Texas, it will not be because she has not the will, but because she wants the power. If she cannot fight us now, she hates us implacably enough to do so when she can. She may seek an alliance with Great Britain, and will rather render up to her possession of California in lieu of the debt to British subjects of $40,000,000, than submit to its falling into possession of the hateful, and robber ambition of the United States. It is not at all unlikely that Great Britain will be nothing loth to arm in such a contest, and receive a rich province for a poor debt, while at the same time she gratifies Mexico by aiding her to "feed fat her grudge," and teaches the young tyrant of the West a lesson that he shall not so "better the instruction" of his hoary teachers in the Old World. Will the North turn, then?

Important News from England.

By the arrival of the packet-ship Liberty, at this port, on Sunday, we have intelligence from England to the 13th ultimo. It is of great interest, being *the resignation of the Tory Ministry, and the accession of Lord John Russell to power.* It is supposed that the consequence will be the abolition of the Corn-Laws, as tremendous efforts will be made to return a Whig Parliament at the next election. The Queen and public opinion are in favor of the views of Lord John Russell, though a Tory majority in both houses is opposed to him. From the London papers we learn that the following is probably the correct list of the new Cabinet:

First Lord of the Treasury,	Lord J. Russell.
Lord Chancellor,	Lord Cottenham.
Secretary of Foreign Affairs,	Earl of Clarendon.
Secretary for the Colonies,	Viscount Palmerston.
Secretary for the Home Department,	Marquis of Normanby.
Chancellor of the Exchequer,	Mr. Baring.
President of the Council,	Marquis of Lansdowne.
President of the Board of Trade,	Mr. Labouchere.
Vice President,	Mr. Sheil.
First Lord of the Admiralty,	Earl of Minto.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland,	Earl Fortescue.
First Commissioner of Woods and Forests,	Earl of Bessborough.
Ambassador to Paris,	Lord Beauvale.
Ambassador to St. Petersburgh,	Marquis of Clanricarde.

Since our last paper there has been one other arrival from Europe with later dates than previously received, but neither that nor the "Liberty" brought any other news of consequence than this of a probable change in the policy of the Government of England.

Capital Punishment.

We have given up nearly the whole of the fourth page of this week to the first half of a letter on Capital Punishment, by the Rev. Mr. Christmas, of London. There is not, I presume, a single "old-organized" Abolitionist but who is in favor of the abolition of the death-penalty; and so entirely is it in accordance with the genius of the reform to which this paper is devoted, that all our readers, I doubt not, are glad that a portion of our "miscellaneous page" should be occasionally given up to this kindred subject.

This letter of Mr. Christmas has not before been republished in this country. It is a masterly argument upon the point of which it treats, and can hardly fail to convince those in whose minds the text in Genesis is the only difficulty in the way in the removal of the gallows. On this subject many persons need no argument. They will not permit a passage of doubtful meaning in the Old Testament to smother their convictions of right, and the promptings of their own reason, and to outweigh the accumulated evidence of the thousands of facts which convince them both of the rightfulness and expediency of the abolition of Capital Punishment. But with many minds who sincerely and conscientiously believe that, in the words "whosoever sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," they have an express command of the Almighty, there is no other, or at least no easier way, than to meet them on their own ground, and convince them of their error.

The advocates of the abolition of the Death Penalty, like the advocates of the abolition of Slavery, do not ask men to change their theology, but to make an application of their own acknowledged principles to this subject. Mr. Christmas is a clergyman of the established church, and from his position as well as from the matter and manner of his argument, will have great weight with those whose theological belief is like his own.

An extra quantity of this and the ensuing number of the Standard will be struck off, in order to give as wide a circulation as possible to this letter. Our friends everywhere, I trust, will put their copy into the hands of those who most need it. Much good in this way may be done with little trouble, and an onward impulse given to a cause which is in accordance with the humanity and progress of the age.

O'Sullivan's Report.

Mr. O'Sullivan, who a few years ago, in our Legislature, made an able Report in favor of the abolition of Capital Punishment, has recently made a donation to the Society of nearly 100 copies. It is a handsomely bound book of 168 pages, and has always been regarded as the standard work on this subject, embracing arguments and statistics very useful to all who would become acquainted with this Reform. For sale at this office, 142 Nassau street. Price, 75 cents. Friends of the abolition will aid the cause by purchasing and at the same time get a good book.

PORTRAIT OF C. M. CLAY.—Those who wish for a portrait of Mr. Clay may be in a few days gratified. Mr. Robinson, of 142 Nassau street, has in hand a lithograph likeness which promises to be all that could be desired. It will come at a very cheap rate, and will be a valuable addition to the collection of Anti-Slavery portraits.

☞ We learn from an exchange paper, that some demonstrations of a mob were made toward Abby Foster in Alleghany city. The patriotic people, however, satisfied themselves by giving three cheers for the Constitution and Washington, at the close of her lecture.

COOL.—The New Jersey Freeman asks the Pennsylvania Freeman to give a notice of the next meeting of the State Society—Liberty party. Should the editors of the Pennsylvania Freeman, or any one who agrees with them in regard to anti-slavery duty, attend this meeting, they would be denied the right to give their views. We will, however, give the notice which the Freeman does not ask of us—namely, that the meeting will be held at Trenton, on the 28th instant; and I moreover earnestly urge all Abolitionists who have no fancy to being gagged, to stay away from it.

☞ SAMUEL S. SNOW, a Millerite preacher in this city, has announced himself as the veritable prophet Elijah. He is said to have something like a hundred followers. One of them declares that when the Lord appointed brother Snow to be Elijah, a dove, white as snow, descended and lit upon him in the presence of all the people.

☞ HENRY INMAN, the Painter, died in this city on Saturday, at noon, in the 45th year of his age.

☞ JOSHUA LEAVITT, of the Emancipator, announces his intention of bringing the Massachusetts Democracy to the test. He wishes to know if they are opposed to Slavery, and believe in "Equal Rights, Equal Laws, Equal Justice to all men, black as well as white"! Mr. Leavitt is certainly progressing. Perhaps somebody in Boston can lend him a copy of the proceedings of the Democratic Convention held at Springfield last fall. It is possible he might get some light on this difficult question.

NEW-YORK LEGISLATURE.—The Legislature has been so far chiefly occupied with the Anti-Rent difficulties: no definite conclusion as yet is the result.

General Samuel Fessenden, of Portland, has been nominated by the third party of Maine, as their candidate for Governor.

The Reverend Charles W. Denison, of Boston, has been expelled from the church in that city. "Charges of glaring falsehood," says the Christian Reflector, "and of obtaining money on false pretences, were sustained against him by an overwhelming amount of evidence."

Congressional.

Congress.

We omitted, for want of room, our usual abstract of Congressional news, last week; but we find little of interest in the reports, except the discussions upon the Oregon question. Mr. Giddings's speech, we gave in last week's paper. Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, made a speech deprecatory of war measures. A skirmish ensued between him and Mr. Adams. The former accusing the latter of favoring a war with Great Britian now, when he was opposed to the last war, both of which charges Mr. A. denied, showing Mr. Rhett's ignorance of the history of that portion of his (Mr. A.'s) life. Mr. Rhett did *not* retort upon Mr. Adams that at about that period of his life, Mr. A. was a traitor to his own party, and to the interests which he had always professed were the paramount interests of New England.

In the House, Mr. Culver, of New-York, gave notice of a Bill to be introduced by him on some future occasion, for the prospective abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

In the Senate, Mr. Allen, of Ohio, made an effort to introduce a bill declaratory of this country's position with regard to foreign interference in the affairs of this continent. Mr. Calhoun opposed the bill. It was laid upon the table—yeas 28, nays 23.

Mr. Crittenden offered the following resolution, which was read, ordered to be printed, and made the special order for the 10th of February next.

A Resolution concerning Oregon Territory.—Whereas, by the convention concluded on the 20th day of October, 1818, between the United States of America and the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, for the period of ten years, and afterwards indefinitely extended and continued in force by another convention of the same parties, concluded the 6th day of August, 1827, it was agreed that any country that may be claimed by either party on Northwest coast of America, westward of the Stony or Rocky Mountains, now commonly called the Oregon territory, should, together with its harbors, bays, and creeks, and the navigation of all rivers within the same, be "free and open" to the vessels, citizens, and subjects of the two powers, but without prejudice to any claim which either of the parties might have to any part of said country; and with this further provision in the second article of the said convention of the 6th August, 1827, that either party might abrogate and annul said convention, on giving due notice of twelve months to the other contracting party:

And whereas it has now become desirable that the respective claims of the United States, and Great Britain should be definitively settled, and that said territory may, no longer than need be, remain subject to the evil consequences of the divided allegiance of its American and British population, and of the confusion and conflict of national jurisdictions, dangerous to the cherished peace and good understanding of the two countries:

With a view, therefore, that steps be taken for the abrogation of the said convention of the 6th August, 1827, in the mode prescribed in its 2d article, and that the attention of the Governments of both countries may be the more earnestly and immediately directed to renewed efforts for the settlement of all their differences and disputes in respect to said territory:

Be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby authorized, at his discretion, to give to the British Government the notice required by its said 2d article for the abrogation of the said convention of the 6th of August, 1827. Provided, however, That in order to afford ample time and opportunity for the amicable settlement and adjustment of all their differences and disputes in respect to said territory, said notice ought not to be given till after the close of the present session of Congress.

16th.—Mr. J. R. INGERSOLL introduced a bill to abolish public executions under United States laws.

17th.—The Senate was not in session. After some unimportant business in the House, Mr. Dromgoole, of Virginia, announced the death of his colleague, Mr. Taylor.

This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry:* Lines from the True American; The Old Clock on the Stairs. *Miscellany:* Capital Punishment unsanctioned by the Gospel, and unnecessary in a Christian state; Origin of Railways; Artificial Fuel; Progress of Chemistry in France; Tampico.

FIRST PAGE.—*The Peculiar Institution:* Slavery in the District; A Negro Thief—Horrible case of Lynching, &c. *Pro-Slavery:* Abolition Lecture at the Tabernacle; Puck on Abolition. *Selections:* Fugitive Slaves in Northern Ohio; Letter from Thomas Clarkson; C. M. Clay's Lecture; Taken at his word; The rights of the Free States Subverted.

SECOND PAGE.—New Bedford Lyceum; The Oregon Question; The London Committee. *Communications:* Letter from Pennsylvania; Organic Sins; Western New-York Anti-Slavery Society; Old Colony Anti-Slavery Society.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

For the Standard—from December 1, 1845, to January 16, 1846.

A. Southwick, Leicester, Mass.	$2.00	
Increase S. Smith, Dorchester, Mass.	2,00	
James Sherman, Milton, N. Y.	1,25	
Peter Wilson, New-York city,	50	
Asaph Turner, Geneva, Ohio	2,00	
Wm. B. Edmondson, Richmond, Ind.	2,00	
Lewis Greenleaf, Weare, N. H.	2,00	
Samuel Johnson, New-York city,	1,00	
James Burr, Ludlowville, N. Y.	1,00	
J. M. McCall, Utica, "	2,00	
Edmund Davis, North Andover, Mass.	2,00	
Jesse Searle, Southampton, "	2,34	
Oliver Cushing, South Hingham, "	2,00	
Lydia L. Ford, North Abington, "	2,00	
Benjamin Cheever, Portsmouth, N. H.	2,00	
Thomas Rand, " "	2,00	
Charles Tidd, Lexington, Mass.	4,00	
C. Palfrey, Barnstable, "	1,00	
Joseph Merriden, Royalton, "	2,00	
Sarah J. Hale, Rochester, N. H.	1,00	
Simeon Reed, Cazenovia, N. Y.	2,00	
Daniel Carmichael, Brooklyn, L. I.	4,00	
Samuel Clark, New Vernon, N. Y.	2,00	
Eliza D. Smith, Macedon, "	2.00	
David Irish, Quaker Hill, "	1,00	
James Brown, Poughkeepsie, "	50	
Benjamin Thompson, Durham, N. H.	1,00	
Samuel Reed, East Abington, Mass.	2.00	
J. D. White, Roxbury, "	2 00	
John E. Morse, Canterbury, Ct.	2,00	
Joseph Dutton, New Garden, Ohio,	3,00	
W. Steadman, Randolph, "	2,00	
Daniel Phelps, Springfield, Mass.	2,00	
Dr. Chas. Robinson, " "	75	
Charles Spaulding, Otiseo, N. Y.	2.50	
David Spaulding, Borodino, "	2 50	
Moses Jay, Nantucket, Mass.	2,00	
David Jay, Northampton, "	4.00	
H. W. Bill, Windham, "	1.00	
Geo. Weatherhead, Killingly, Ct.	2.00	
Asa S. White, Keene, N. H.	2.00	
Mrs. J. Quincy, Boston, Mass.	5,00	
Abraham Allen, Oakland, Ohio,	2,50	
E. D. Merriam, Boston, Mass.	2.00	
Wanton Rowe, Thompson, Ct.	2.00	
Origin Stowe, " "	2,00	
		91,84
Donations.		
Portland Association, per Loring Moody,	$25,00	
J. N. Buffum, Lynn, Mass.	20,00	
		45,00
Total amount.		$136,84

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

General Items.

Mormonism still a "Leetle Ahead."—The Sangamo Journal of the 1st inst. says: Mr. Roberts, as Deputy Marshal, was sent to Nauvoo to make arrests of persons charged with counterfeiting the coin of the realm. As the accounts goes, Mr. Roberts reached Nauvoo, and procured a person to point out to him Brigham Young. An individual was indicated as this person. The Deputy arrested him took him to Carthage, and there, after making him doff his outer habiliments, it was found that the individual arrested was not the said Young, but a person who had been attired to resemble him. In the meantime, we suppose, the holy Brigham was not on hand in Nauvoo.

The treaty of the Mormons with the Governor, and the fact that they have fast friends among the party demagogues at the seat of Government, will enable them to laugh at Uncle Sam's officers, unless a more determined and resolute course is pursued by the Government than has been thus far, to render law something more than a mere mockery.—*St. Louis Republican.*

It is rumored that Mr. Gough will shortly change his vocation as Temperance Lecturer to that of the Orthodox Congregational ministry. He intends to spend the remainder of the winter in the South.

We learn that Rev. Dr. Putnam, of Roxbury, has been invited to occupy the chair of Hollis Professor of Divinity at Cambridge—vacated by the death of Rev. Dr. Ware.—*Boston Mer. Journal.*

Blue Ink.—A cotemporary cautions his readers not to use blue ink for their correspondence by mail. He says:

"We have this moment received a letter from a friend in Alabama, which was written with blue ink. It bears date July 21, and has been full long enough in reaching its destination: and in obedience to the *law* which requires the mails at an enormous expense, to be conveyed in *covered carriages*, it has been wet through and through, leaving but faint traces of the contents. Had the letter been penned with black ink, it would have stood the test of the soaking which all letters must occasionally receive, so long as mail contractors are permitted to use the mails as a covering for the baggage of stage passengers!

Indemnity for Slaves Captured by England in the last War.—The very interesting development which Mr. Rhett provoked from Mr. Adams, in relation to payment which the latter Statesman *extorted* from England, for slaves carried away during the war of 1812, is full of instruction to the North and of warning to the South.

If the grasping for territory, *orginating* in a determination to enlarge the area of Slavery, results in a war with England, for every *one* slave liberated in 1812, '13, and '14, there will be ONE HUNDRED! And for these slaves, when peace returns, *there will be no indemnity!* England is not the England she was. She has no slave property of her own to be protected now. Since that war she has emancipated her millions of African slaves. She will now spurn the demand for indemnity. Nor would any Northern Statesman now, as in 1814, dream of urging such a demand.

Let the South, therefore, go into this war with its eyes open. It is a war of their own seeking. It is the war of a Southern President, in whose hands the question of Peace or War rests. Let Virginia, and South Carolina, and Georgia, and Louisiana, and Alabama, whose coasts are exposed, see to this matter.—*Albany Eve. Jour.*

Dreadful Accident—It is said that a terrible accident occurred at Carbondale, Pa. on Monday last. From four to six acres of ground suddenly caved in, burying alive about thirty miners who were engaged in their occupation. Those who were dug out were quite dead.

The Parkersburg Affair—A letter from Richmond, Virginia, says: "A requisition has been made by the authorities of Parkersburg, for three hundred stand of arms, and they have been sent from the armory. The cause of this requisition is a threat on the part of the Ohio people to invade the town, and liberate the kidnappers there confined."

George N. Briggs and John Reed were chosen Governor and Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts by the Senate of that State on Monday afternoon.

Horrible joke.—Three ruffians were committed for trial by Justice Osborn, for blowing off the ear of a poor negro, while asleep, with gunpowder, a train of which they laid from his ear for some distance, and then touched it off with a lighted cigar.

Sudden death in the pulpit.—A colored preacher named James Hill, fell dead in the pulpit, while preaching at a protracted meeting in Lower Penn's Neck, Salem county, West Jersey, on Wednesday last.

Later from Texas.—Texas papers have been received here to the 1st instant.

The election in Texas has resulted in the election of J. P. Henderson for Governor, and A. C. Horton for Lieut. Governor. There were seventy-five members elected to the Legislature, sixty-five of whom are Houston Democrats. It was said that Gen. Houston would not only himself be elected to the United States Senate by a large majority, but that he would also select his colleague.

John Rice Jones, formerly Post Master General of the Republic, died recently.

Hon. Timothy Pillsbury has been nominated at several public meetings, as a candidate for Congress.

Among the passengers who lately arrived at Galveston, was the son of the celebrated naturalist, Audubon. He intends visiting the Western section of Texas, to obtain ornithological specimens for his father.

New-York on Cheap Postage.—In the Assembly on Wednesday, Mr. ISOT CLARK, of Niagara, moved the following resolutions, which were forthwith unanimously adopted, viz:

Whereas, in obedience to numerous petitions and other indications of a general public opinion, the last Congress of the United States passed a law materially reducing postage on letters passing through the mail, below former rates; in the propriety of which reduction the people of this State have accorded with great unanimity; and many are of opinion there should be a still farther reduction; and whereas indications have been given that an attempt will be made in the present Congress to raise the charges on mail letters above the present rates: therefore,

Resolved, As the sense of this Legislature, (if the honorable Senate concur herein,) That the rates of letter postage are already sufficiently high, and should not be increased; that the present system has not yet been in operation sufficiently long to test its propriety or fully ascertain its results.

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be requested to use their best endeavors to prevent any increase of the present rate of postage.

Resolved, That copies of the foregoing resolutions be transmitted to each of our Senators and Representatives.

Americans in the Dominican Service.—The American bark Alert, recently purchased by the Dominican Government to be fitted as a vessel of war, has been got in readiness, and she mounts twenty twenty-four pounders and two swivels of the same or greater calibre. She is represented as being commanded by a "fine, young, cool, calm, and daring American, and a picked crew of fifty able and prime seamen."

Randolph's Slaves.—We learn from the Colonization Journal that Judge Leigh, the executor of John Randolph, has purchased a large tract of land in Mercer County, Ohio, on which to locate the slaves, some 300, manumitted by that remarkable man. A large quantity of land in Mercer County, comprising three or four townships, is now owned nearly altogether by colored persons.

From Haiti.—Cape Haytien, January 4.—By the departure of the brig Smyrna, we embrace this opportunity to inform you of the state of the market. At the present time there are no less than seventeen vessels in port, six of which are from Boston. The market is literally glutted with American produce. Flour is selling at $24, Haitian currency—Codfish, $12 a $12 1-2—Pork, $40 a $45. Doubloons are worth $59, and but very few to be had even at that price. Coffees is held at 19 3-4 a 20 cents, and but very little coming in, owing to the scarcity of labor. Every man is a soldier, and the whole time is taken up in learning military tactics, in preparation for the grand march of the whole army against the Spanish part of the Island, that will move on or before the 1st of March.

Of the Haitian fleet that left here some two weeks since, for an attack on Port-au-Platt, four of the five were wrecked in the harbor of that place; the other, a very small vessel, escaped. It is supposed that a great portion of their crews were lost. This was a great loss for the Haitians, but notwithstanding, they are now fitting out a fleet of five or six vessels for the same port.

The American bark Nautilus, was fired into by the Haitian fleet, the captain ordered on board the Haitian vessel, and required to give up his papers. After having detained him some time, he was suffered to depart with his papers. All this was done while our flag was at her mast-head, and on the high seas, some twenty-five miles from the land. We hope soon to see some of our armed vessels in these waters.—*Cor. Boston Post.*

State Convention in Virginia.—In the House of Delegates, yesterday, Mr. Leftwich, from the Select Committee on the subject, reported a bill for taking the sense of the people on the call of a Convention to amend the Constitution of the State, and for other purposes. And Mr. L. also presented a report from the minority of the Committee. The bill provides for organizing a Convention on the basis of the present House of Delegates, with 134 members, to be chosen as the delegates are now chosen. The Minority Report objects to the organization, and insists upon the *white* basis as the only true representative principle. The bill and minority report were ordered to be printed.—*Richmond Whig.*

Judge Garland.—The New Orleans Picayune of the 30th ult. says of this fallen man: "Judge Garland, it is said, has fled to the West Indies. After two unsuccessful attempts to commit suicide, he has thrown himself among strangers. Would that all memory of his crime could be obliterated with his disappearance, so that his misdeeds be not visited upon the innocent."

The London *Post* of the 8th ult. says:—We have great satisfaction in being enabled to announce that an event, calculated to strengthen the affectionate attachment of the people to the throne, and at the same time increase the happiness of her Majesty's domestic circle, may be expected to take place early in April next.

NOTICES.

PEACE CONVENTION.

A general Convention of the friends of Peace will be held in MECHANIC'S HALL, in the city of Providence, R. I., TUESDAY, the 27th day of January, at 10 o'clock, A. M. to continue two days. Several eminent friends of the cause from Providence, Boston, and elsewhere, are expected to address the Convention; and all citizens desirous of peace are invited to attend and participate.

E. B HALL,
S. OSGOOD.
S. W. WHEELER, } *Committee.*

MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY—ANNUAL MEETING.

The Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society will be held in the city of Boston, on the FOURTH WEDNESDAY of the present month, January 28th, 1846. All auxiliary societies are urged to be numerously represented, and the faithful friends of the cause, in all parts of the country, are cordially invited to attend. The crisis demands that this should be the largest and most effective meeting ever held by the Society. "God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts!"

FRANCIS JACKSON, President.
EDMUND QUINCY, Secretary.
January 15, 1846.

PARKER PILLSBURY WILL LECTURE AS FOLLOWS:

Lancaster,	Saturday and Sunday,	Jan. 10 and 11
Leominster,	Monday and Tuesday,	" 12 and 13
Lunenburg,	Wednesday,	" 14
Stoughton,	Monday and Tuesday,	" 19 and 20
North Bridgewater,	Wednesday,	" 21
Middleboro',	Thursday,	" 22
Plympton,	Friday and Saturday,	" 23 and 24
Plymouth,	Sunday,	" 25
Kingston,	Monday,	" 26
Duxbury,	Tuesday,	" 27

☞ As several of the above places are entirely new, it is hoped the friends of the cause in the other towns will be as liberal as possible in their contributions.

PARKER PILLSBURY.

January 15, 1846.

MARLBOROUGH CONFERENCE.

For the distribution of the pamphlets directed to be printed in the tenth month last, as well as for the consideration of other important subjects which may arise, a meeting

Poetry.

From the True American.

We receive many such communications as this, but for obvious reasons are compelled to refuse publication—we do not feel at liberty to refuse this.—Ed.

At a meeting of the Ladies' County Anti-Slavery Society, (Ashtabula, O.) December 9th, it was voted that the following, which was read from the anonymous box of the Secretary, be forwarded to the "True American" for publication. Please insert and oblige very many of your readers. BETSEY M. COWLES,
Secretary of the Ladies' County A. S. Society.

"*All but my wife and mother advised me to yield.*"
APPEAL OF C. M. CLAY.

Worthy to be a hero's bride!—
Thou, who in peril's hour,
Stood calmly by the sufferer's side,
With heart that could not cower.
True-hearted woman!—thou hast won
A bright, immortal wreath!
Thou who could'st nerve thy loved one on,
To Victory—or Death!

When fierce Oppression's wildest storm
Was pelting on his head—
When Slavery raised her murderous arm
Above that fevered bed—
When foes were rushing like a flood,
And friends were quailing there—
'Twas helpless *woman's* heart that stood,
Alone, unbowed by fear.

Yes, manhood's soul of iron could fail
Before that raging power;
And friendship's flashing zeal could quail
In that decisive hour.
Two voices bade him *never* shrink
Beneath the deadly strife;
They who to him were closest linked—
That *mother* and that *wife!*

The fragile form whose all of hope
Upon *his* life was hung,—
That mother who had cherished up
That head since life was young;
The gentle-hearted wife, whose hand
To his had trusting clung—
These bade the victim proudly stand,
Where perils swept along!

Aye, trusting woman—fearless wife!
Thine was the noblest part—
Thine was the bitterest, wildest strife,
Of loving woman's heart.
To watch by that lone couch of pain,
In love's strong agony—
To cool that wildly throbbing brain,
Still—still—unceasingly!

And then!—to seat thee calmly *then*
By that faint victim's side,
And trace, with thine own fearless pen,
His words of dauntless pride;
Rather with him to bravery sink,
Than bend to *Slavery's* power!
Oh Love! thou *only* canst not sink
In Danger's darkest hour!

We crown the names of Spartan dames
With an immortal life;
And her's who sank 'mid Afric's flames—
Asdrubal's peerless wife.
Bring forth for *her* a noble wreath,
Who, not for deathless *Fame*,
Looked calmly in the face of Death—
For FREEDOM'S sacred name!

Worthy to be a hero's wife,
Thou heroine tried and true!—
Worthy to give that hero life,
Thou patriot mother, too!
For you we pluck no laurel-tree—
We 'twine no fading lay;
Columbia's crown is yours—to be
The *mother—wife*—of CLAY!

DECEMBER 9th, 1845. MARIE.

THE OLD CLOCK ON THE STAIRS.

BY H. W. LONGFELLOW.

"L'eternite est un pendule, dont le balancier dit et redit sans cesse ces deux mots seulement, dans le silence des tombeaux: "Toujours! jamais! Jamais! toujours!"—*Jacques Bridaine.*

Somewhat back from the village street
Stands the old-fashioned country seat.
Across its antique portico
Tall poplar trees their shadows throw;
And from its station in the hall
An ancient time-piece says to all,—
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

Halfway up the stairs it stands,
And points and beckons with its hands
From its case of massive oak,
Like a monk, who under his cloak
Crosses himself, and sighs, alas!
With sorrowful voice to all who pass,—
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

By day its voice is low and light,
But in the silent dead of night,
Distinct as a passing footstep's fall,
It echoes along the vacant hall,
Along the ceiling, along the floor,
And seems to say at each chamber door,
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

In that mansion used to be
Free-hearted Hospitality,
His great fires up the chimney roared,
The stranger feasted at his board;
But like the skeleton at the feast,
That warning time-piece never ceased,—
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

There groups of merry children played,
There youths and maidens dreaming strayed,
Oh, precious hours! O, golden prime
And affluence of love and time!
Even as a miser counts his gold,
Those hours the ancient time-piece told,—
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

From that chamber, clothed in white,
The bride came forth on her wedding night,
There, in that silent room below,
The dead lay in his shroud of snow;
And in the hush that followed the prayer
Was heard the old clock, on the stair,—
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

All are scattered now and fled,
Some are married, some are dead;
And when I ask, with throbs of pain,
'Ah, when shall they all meet again
As in the days long since gone by,'
The ancient time-piece makes reply,—
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

Never here, forever there,
Where all parting, pain, and care,
And death, and time shall disappear,—
Forever there, but never here!
The horologe of Eternity
Sayeth this incessantly,—
"Forever—never!
Never—forever!"

Miscellany.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENTS UNSANCTIONED BY THE GOSPEL, AND UNNECESSARY IN A CHRISTIAN STATE.

A Letter to the Rev. Sir John Page Wood, Bart. B. C. L. by the Rev. Henry Christmas, M. A. F. R. S. F. S. A. late of St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. Cornhill: 1845.

MY DEAR SIR JOHN,—One of the most solemn and important subjects to which the mind of the Christian magistrate can be turned, is the necessity and indeed the lawfulness of capital punishments, and I am sufficiently aware of your sentiments to feel assured that you will not be displeased at my freedom in addressing a few remarks on this topic to yourself.

As occupying at once the position of a magistrate, and the far higher one of a Presbyter of our Church, an interpreter of "Holy Mysteries," I know of none to whom I could more appropriately address myself, certainly none to whose opinions I look with greater respect. The consciousness that those opinions coincide with my own, emboldens me to state, with less hesitation, my inability to receive the ordinary idea that the punishment of death is commanded by the Divine Word, if in no other cases, at least in those of bloodshed.

And if I venture to call in question the truth of a theory so extensively received, I do it not hastily, nor without much diffidence. When I first approached the subject, I felt perfectly persuaded that the punishment of death inflicted by the civil magistrate was not only of Divine appointment, but also of universal obligation. It has been gradually and slowly that this persuasion has been changed. One by one, and after much thought and patient investigation, the arguments in its favor from Holy Scripture were proved, to my satisfaction, to be only apparent, and the Divine revelation, as a whole, became only the more clearly and palpably consistent.

There is, however, a great preliminary difficulty in maintaining a proposition like that which I have advanced—the objections to it are easy and plausible, but the arguments by which alone it can be supported, are difficult and abstruse. Many other theological truths are in the same predicament; the Antinomian, for instance, has an apparently plain and simple theory. The divine who would vindicate against him the perfect justice of God, must plunge into the depths of metaphysical science; and however accurate his reasoning, there will be probably few capable of understanding it.

The belief that capital punishments are sanctioned by Christianity, is not a mere reverie of thoughtless men, nor the willing persuasion of callous and cruel minds—that it is an error I have no longer any doubt—but it is an error supported by arguments subtle, if fallacious, and by piety sincere, if mistaken. I must beg, therefore, the candid inquirer to weigh attentively the evidence which I shall have to lay before him, and to believe that I have no desire to dogmatize on a subject which I confess to be so difficult, and which I feel to be so important.

II.—(1.) It is contended in favor of capital punishments, that they are necessary on moral and political grounds, and that they have the sanction of a divine command; and though in these pages my chief object is to disprove the latter assertion, so far, at least, as regards men living under a Christian dispensation, yet I must briefly touch on the moral and political, as well as the theological question, partly because this tract may fall into many hands to whom the train of thought which it presents would otherwise be incomplete, and partly because the two questions are so involved and interlaced the one with the other, that it is impossible to regard them from entirely separate points of view.

(2.) What then are the moral and political reasons for death as a punishment? We dismiss at once the idea of reformation as absurd, and that of vengeance as unchristian; and we have, 1. The safety of society by the deterring others from similar crimes: 2. The putting it out of the criminal's power to offend again.

(3.) To the first of these assertions it may be replied, that capital punishment never did effectually deter men from crime, and statistical researches will prove that, in every case where it has been abolished, the kind of crime affected by it has decreased. We do not suppose that men stand in greater fear of transportation or imprisonment than of death, but parties offended will more readily prosecute, and witnesses will more freely give evidence, and juries will more unhesitatingly convict, when the life of a fellow-creature is not placed in jeopardy.

(4.) There is not a punishment inflicted by law, how slight soever it may be, that is not far more prejudicial to the party punished, than the proceeds of the crime can be beneficial. No criminal balances between the pleasure or the advantage obtained by his offence, and the injury done to his person or prospects by the sentence of a court. His *only* inducement to violate the law is the expectation of absolute impunity; and if, in addition to the chance of not being found out, be added the improbability of prosecution, or full evidence, or conviction, on account of the great severity of the law, it is evident that an additional prospect is given to the success of crime.

(5.) This is a general proposition, but it is not the less forcible when applied to the punishment of death in particular, and if it be replied that death is no longer inflicted except in cases of murder, and that, therefore, the manifest injustice is avoided, of subjecting to the same terrific penalty, offences of widely different degrees of criminality:—we answer, that it is impossible to bring forward two cases of *murder*, in which the same exact amount of atrocity is exhibited, and that juries have been obliged to give verdicts of manslaughter, simply because a more correct decision would endanger the life of the criminal.

(6.) And as allusion has been made to juries, who does not see the little regard paid by them to the *literal terms* of their oath? If the law had not, by its excessive severity, given a somewhat conventional meaning to that solemn obligation, would a jury have found, in times past, that a ten pound note was under the value of forty shillings, or in our own day acquitted such criminals as Mary and Faith Sealy? and if the moral feelings of juries in general had not been manifestly weakened, could such a verdict have been returned as that which was returned in the late lamentable case of Mr. Marsh, at Peterborough?

(7.) In thus speaking, it is not intended to infer that jurors are more deficient in integrity than other men, but only that in adopting the office of a juror they adopt a code of morality by which they would not be guided in other cases; and this arises from their willingly losing sight of the principle on which they are empannelled, and regarding the sentence which their verdict will produce, rather than the evidence on which that verdict is to be given. It can scarcely admit of a doubt that this erroneous view of a juror's duties has arisen from the severity of the law. Men are not sufficient casuists to see that in judging according to evidence, they have accomplished their duty,—they confound the sentence of the law with the verdict of the jury, and look on themselves as having consigned a fellow-creature to death. And in proportion as they feel the importance of Christian duties, and the consequences in another world of their neglect, in the same ratio will they be unwilling to be in any way instrumental to the destruction of an unprepared man.

(8.) It has been asserted on statistic evidence, carefully and impartially prepared, that as deterring others from the commission of crime, the punishment of death has signally failed. Nay, the very execution of the tremendous sentence has been attended by the commission of a host of minor offences, and young criminals have made their first essays in crime before the dead body of their more hardened brother was removed from their eyes. Besides this, there is a martyrology of the gibbet. The last words and demeanor of eminent criminals have been carefully recorded, and related as soldiers relate those of a Wolff, or churchmen those of a Ridley.

(9.) As to any restraint upon the criminal himself, it is evident that society may be protected in many ways against further attempts on his part.—Indeed, the happy rarity of executions is enough to convince us that but little fear is entertained on that account, while the number of murders which have lately filled our newspapers, affords a melancholy proof that, as a preventive, capital punishment cannot be relied on. I shall not occupy more time in regarding the moral and political aspect of the question, but shall proceed to what is my chief object in these pages, viz: the investigation of the sanction which the punishment of death is supposed to derive from Holy Scripture.

III.—(1.) It is necessary here to premise that I address myself to Christians, to those who accept the authority of Scripture *in toto*, and who are willing to accept *any* conclusions to which it can be fairly shown to lead them, and not to those who cite it as binding upon others without allowing it to be binding upon themselves. Thus premising, we shall find that the chief support which capital punishments receive will be found,

I. In the sixth verse of the ninth chapter of Genesis, where occur in our version the words, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by blood shall his blood be shed."

II. In the frequent repetition of similar sanctions under the Mosaic dispensation.

III. In the absence of any express prohibition on the part of our Lord and his Apostles.

But before we proceed to support capital punishments by reason of the sanction supposed to be given to them in the ninth chapter of Genesis, we must prove two things:—

I. That the spiritual condition of man under the Gospel is precisely the same with respect to his responsibilities, as it was under the Patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations;—for if the parrallel fail here, the argument falls to the ground; and

II. That the passage referred to really does enjoin the punishment of death in cases of bloodshed.

I think we shall be able to show that neither of these things can be proved. The case is, however one by no means clear from difficulty, for—

(2.) If it be said that knowing the terrible consequences of death to the unprepared sinner, we have no right to diminish his chances of salvation by shortening his life,—it will be replied, that the soul of man is of no more value now than it was under the law of Moses, and that if *he* commanded by inspiration the punishment of death, our objection amounts to an imputation against the mercy of God, and implies a desire on our part to rectify a defect on his. Thus the ground appears to be cut away from beneath our feet, for who would not hesitate at embracing a theory which seems to reflect on the Divine goodness, and to elevate the wisdom of man above that of God?

(3.) And yet when we regard the condition of a murderer, habituated for many years to the commission of crime, (and we have a right for our argument to take an extreme case,)—when we regard, then, the mental and moral state of such a man—the hardened heart, the seared conscience, the degraded tastes, we shall see but little chance of his speedy conversion. Every day of such a life as that which he has led has tended to alienate him still more from his Maker, and to make repentance more difficult; his moral perceptions are daily more blunted, and the agitation which the approach of a violent death *must* produce, can hardly be a favorable preparation for eternity! Indeed, we find on inquiry that the faculties of such men become affected with a moral paralysis. They may conduct themselves with outward decorum; but too often the mind has become incapable of serious attention, and wanders apathetically through the mazes of the past.

(4.) All Christians acknowledge the extreme danger in which such a man is placed, and we have no reason to suppose that God will pardon any man's offences simply on the ground that he was cut off in the midst of them. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die;" and if the Divine mercy is necessarily to be extended to every man who is prevented by a violent death from a timely repentance; then, not the gibbet alone, the garote, or the guillotine, but murder, drowning, the sword of an enemy in battle, apoplexy, or any accidental death, must be a sufficient passport to eternal happiness.

(5.) And as this part of our argument is one of great consequence, I shall, even at the risk of being tedious, place it in as strong a light as I can. It is an awful idea that man should be accessory to the damnation of his fellow-man, and *that* in the way of a just punishment; and it is impossible to say that the temporal death inflicted by the law shall not be followed by the eternal death denounced by the wrath of God against sin. If a murderer has sent his victim unprepared to stand before his Maker, and by this crime has been instrumental to the ruin of a soul, the mischief is not remedied by the ruin of another, nor does it altogether suffice to say that the guilt of the murderer, and not our sentence, has been the cause of his destruction; for had he lived, he might have lived to repent. Again, it is altogether unsatisfactory to say that time is given for repentance, inasmuch as we have no means of ascertaining what period is sufficient, or how the respite actually allowed may have been employed. The last days of some notorious malefactors, Shepherd, for instance, were occupied far otherwise than in any preparation for eternity; and a case occurred not long since of a criminal who died with a lie in his mouth. What hope can the Christian have of such characters?

(6.) But there seems to have tacitly grown up in many minds the idea, that as man has taken away from such persons the opportunity of repentance; that is to say, the amount of opportunity enjoyed by men in general, that they are taken out of the ordinary category of sinners, and that they will therefore be judged by a different rule. I do not mean that such a theory is ever formally enunciated; but it is allowed more or less to appear: we are reminded of the "*uncovenanted mercies*" of God; we are told of the allowance which he will make for different circumstances and different capacities, and thus men endeavor to persuade themselves that no more harm is done by the block or gibbet than the removal of an evil-doer from among men.

(7.) But if we imagine that this extraordinary mercy is to be shown, it is of course in consequence of the sudden cutting off of the criminal. Let us then suppose that a man who has led a wicked life, and who might at any time have repented of his sins, is drowned at sea, do we augur well for his salvation by reason of this catastrophe? And yet, according to the views alluded to, if the man who has perhaps two, three, or four weeks to prepare for death is to be judged by a more lenient rule than other men, much more should the same mercy be extended to him who has but an hour or two; besides, a fever, an attack of cholera, or indigestion will be far more rapid in its effects than the process of law, even when sentence of death is pronounced, and a criminal left for execution.

(8.) From all this it results that capital punishment tends awfully to the spiritual destruction of those submitted to it; and as it is certain that under the Mosaic dispensation, at least, it *was* commanded, we must be prepared either to show that its consequences were *then* less terrific, or to sit down with all the doubt and perplexity which such reflexions as those which we have been led to make must occasion us. We shall have reason and revelation arrayed one against the other, and the Divine sanction justifying a course dangerous to the souls of men. Nor can we escape from the dilemma by saying that our reason is not competent to judge of the case, for it is not unaided reason, but reason supported by a thousand passages of the revealed Word of God! We have too many texts which set forth the fearful consequences of death to the ungodly—the difficulties in the way of repentance—the rarity of sudden conversions, and the danger of self-deception, not to feel how awfully perilous is the situation of a malefactor condemned to death.

(9.) Let us then consider whether, under earlier dispensations, the responsibilities of mankind were lighter, and their spiritual condition in any other respects different from our own. Infidels have triumphantly asserted that the Old Testament Scriptures contain no allusions to a future state, and do not teach the immortality of the soul; and though it would be too much to admit this assertion in all its extent, we are compelled with Warburton to allow that the law of God, as given to Moses, was a law proposing only temporal rewards in cases of obedience, and temporal punishments in cases of transgression. If the mass of the chosen people had any idea of future rewards and punishments, it would appear that it was by tradition, and not by express revelation.

(10.) The punishments of that law were arranged according to a scale commencing with pecuniary fines of a small extent, and reaching through certain temporary separations from the congregation, to the penalty of death by stoning, or in some cases even by fire. But one idea runs through every enactment of the Mosaic code, whether it be penalty or whether it be sacrifice, viz: that of propitiation; and thus the punishment of death inflicted upon the offender assumes as direct an aspect of expiatory sacrifice as the offering of a bull or of a goat for sin. We are led to this conclusion from observing, that the provisions of the law by which death is denounced against certain offences, are found among others which expressly state this principle,—if a man kill the ox or the ass of his neighbor, he shall make it good,* if he deprive his neighbor of an eye, he shall suffer the loss of an eye himself; if an ox gore a man, the ox shall be put to death, and his flesh shall not be eaten;† but if the animal was known to be dangerous, then the life of the owner as well as the life of the beast was to be sacrificed. Indeed, blood was in a peculiar manner regarded as sacred—the blood of beasts as well as the blood of man: and there is one passage so remarkable on this topic, that were there no others, it would be sufficient to make us pause before we accepted the Mosaic value of blood as binding upon us: it occurs in the third and fourth verses of the seventeenth chapter of Leviticus, and provides that any person slaying a sacrifice to the Lord from among his own cattle in the fields, instead of bringing it to the door of the tabernacle, shall be put to death. "He *hath shed blood, and that man shall be cut off from among his people.*"

(11.) Whence, then, this high value set upon blood? It is clear that it regarded not the *actual* but the *typical* value. Every part of the Mosaic law was calculated to bring before the mind of the Israelite a constant system of expiation, and the fact that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." But if God required the life of *man* as an expiation, according to the scale by which in like manner he required the life of *an ox*, it is clear that the expiation was as satisfactory in the one case as in the other, and the temporal punishment received as a satisfaction for the crime. But this theory demands that there should be an onward looking to some more perfect atonement of which all these expiatory sacrifices, whether human or animal, were but the types and shadows, and hence, as Christians, we believe that it was by faith in a *coming Saviour* that the Israelite obtained salvation.

(12.) If we are right in regarding these enactments as providing a *typical* but *expiatory* sacrifice, it is clear that they were then looked on in a light in which it is impossible *now* to contemplate them. Now that "there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin,"* that types and shadows have passed away, and that we look back on an atonement already accomplished—on "one full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,"† it must be clear that capital punishments follow the rule of the daily sacrifice, and are not only no longer required, but no longer lawful.—The spiritual condition of the man whose life is taken *as an expiation for his offences*, under a typical dispensation, is manifestly widely different from that of a man whose life is taken from him without any idea of expiation, and whose acceptance with God is to be sought on totally different grounds.

(13.) But a still farther light is thrown on the subject by the great variety of offences punished with death; cursing a father or a mother, striking them, blaspheming the name of the Lord, the eating of blood, adultery, incest, unnatural offences, rape, murder, and a host of other transgressions, were all punished with death. These enactments prove to us that we must regard the philosophy of the Mosaic code as a whole, and with a reference to its typical and expiatory character, and not as a system of legislature capable of application to Christian times.

(14.) Then again the permission of polygamy, concubinage, and many other practices prohibited under Christianity, evidences a different standard of morals. Indeed this is expressly allowed in the New Testament, for our Lord himself remarks, "Moses, for the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives;"‡ and St. Paul applies the same rule *generally* when he declares to the Athenians, that "the times of this ignorance God winked at."§ Now we find polygamy and concubinage, and what we, as Christians, should call a lax system of morals on cognate subjects, prevailing among the patriarchs long before Moses. We have instances in Abraham, Lot, Jacob, Judah,—in two of these cases, at least, without offence to God, and in the others, without any intimation to that effect.—We do not allude, be it observed, to the incest of Lot, but to his offering his daughters to the men of Sodom. As, I say, we have all these præ-mosaic instances of a different standard of morals to that introduced by our Lord, and as we know that typical sacrifices were coeval with Abel, if not earlier, so we may safely declare, that mankind were regulated by a different moral code before the coming of Christ, and subjected to inferior responsibilities, proportionate to their inferior light, and more especially that the man put to death for transgression under the patriarchal or Mosaic law, stood in a very different and far more favorable relation to God, than a man similarly put to death under the Gospel dispensation.

IV.—(1) We shall now examine the passage in Genesis to which allusion has already been made. "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" and it is contended that this cannot be repealed by Christianity, inasmuch as it was no part of the Mosaic ceremonial law; but that being of prior obligation it was necessarily universal.—Faber, in his admirable work on "The Three Dispensations," has pointed out the universality of the patriarchal, the restrictive character of the Judaic, and the renewed universality of the Gospel scheme. Thus we admit the Sabbath to be binding upon us, not merely because we find it in the decalogue, but because it was of patriarchal obligation.

(2.) But even here we must make a difference between those observances which are typical of Christ, and those which are not; and we shall find not a few patriarchal laws which follow the rule of the Mosaic ceremonial, and cease because their great ANTITYPE has been revealed. Sacrifices were of patriarchal obligation; circumcision of patriarchal obligation; yet the first have been forbidden and the latter remitted by the express authority of the Gospel, and manifestly because that which they foreshadowed has been fully revealed. Hence it will not be sufficient to show that any ordinance was by Divine appointment observed by the patriarchs.—We must also show that it was not typical of Christ, and so repealed by his incarnation. On this ground sacrifices are prohibited because they did adumbrate his perfect expiation, which is now accomplished.—On this ground the Sabbath is *not* repealed, because it typified, and does typify, the rest that remaineth for the people of God.

(3.) We are not, therefore, entitled to continue the use of capital punishments simply on the ground that it was of Divine authority during the patriarchal ages, unless we are prepared to show that the moral and spiritual condition of man is unchanged, and unless also we are prepared to adopt animal sacrifices and circumcision as resting on the same ground.

(4.) But it is yet to be shown that the passage (Gen. ix. 6.) does give any command for the shedding of man's blood. We will first take the authorized version:—

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed;" this contains no necessary command; it may be a prophecy, it may be denunciation, but I think it scarcely a sufficient warrant for execution, even as it stands—it is not "let him be put to death,"—it is not "thou shalt stone him with stones that he die"—it is not "he shall be cut off from among his people"—it is not "let him die the death"—it is not, in short, a phrase implying any judicial sentence at all; the more natural and obvious meaning would be, "I will not allow crime to be unpunished," "whoso committeth violence, I will cause him to fall by violence," "with the froward man I will show myself froward," "and so sacred will I hold blood, that even at the hand of beasts will I require the blood of man which they have shed." Furthermore, we do not treat Scriptural denunciations in the same rigid manner ordinarily; when the voice of inspiration declares that "bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days,"‖ we do not suppose that any command is given to put them to death when we suppose that their days are half spent. When the prophet Isaiah says, that those who "refuse and rebel" "shall be devoured with the sword,"¶ we do not conceive that any command is implied to put such persons to the sword. Again, when our Lord says, "But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck and that he were drowned in the depths of the sea;"** we know that our Lord is speaking of the punishment of sin in the hands of God, and we take all these, and similar denunciations, but as intimations of the certainty of that justice which must sooner or later overtake the guilty. But in the next place,

(5.) It is doubtful whether our version does give the exact sense of the passage, or whether the original will *bear* the translation which we have given it. The great Camlet translated the verse thus:

"*Quiconque aura repandu le sang humain* SERA PUNI *par l'effusion de son propre sang.*"

In this version the words in capitals are his own interpolation.

John Frederick Ostervald, on the other hand, renders it—

"Qui aura repandu le sang de l'homme dans l'homme, son sang sera repandu."

This is as nearly literal as can be.

The Vulgate has

"Quicumque effuderit humanum sanguinem, fudetur sanguis illius."

The Septuagint has

Ὁ ἐκχέων αἷμα ἀνθρώπου, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ ἐκχυθήσεται.

The Spanish version of Scio gives us,

"Todo el que derramare sangre humana, sera derramada su sangre."

To these we may add Wycliffe, who renders the passage,

"**Whosoeure shedyth out manne's bloode, his bloode schall be shedde.**"

Thus there are five important versions, to which might easily be added many of less note, which altogether reject the words "*by man*," in the second member of the sentence.

On the other hand, Cranmer, Tonstall, and Ridley, Coverdale, Matthew, Beza, and the Bishops, interpolate the words "*by man.*"

In this agree Luther and Giovanni Diodati.

The Chaldee has a curious gloss, it may be translated,

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood before men—that is, before witnesses, shall by the sentence of the judge be exposed to the same pain."†

The Rabbis generally understand it,

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood by means of false witnesses, shall suffer the same penalty which has been unjustly inflicted by his means."

(6.) The varieties thus given will suffice to show that the passage is not one on which we should depend for the continuance of so terrible an institution as that of capital punishments.

But an examination of the original in connection with the above given versions, will perhaps enable us to form a clearer opinion; the difficulty obviously lies in those words which the English translators in general have rendered, "*by man,*" which Ostervald translates "in man," and which the LXX, the Vulgate, Wycliffe, and Scio, omit altogether. Let us then see how stands the original.

שֹׁפֵךְ דַּם הָאָדָם בָּאָדָם דָּמוֹ יִשָּׁפֵךְ כִּי
בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים עָשָׂה אֶת הָאָדָם

The difficulty, therefore, lies in the words בָּאָדָם "*in man,*" "*through man,*" "*with man,*" how it should be rendered, and to which member of the sentence it belongs, whether, in fact, with Cranmer and Luther, we are to divide the verse,

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood,
By man shall his blood be shed."

or adopting the idea expressed by Ostervald, read,

"Whoso sheddeth the blood of man that is in him,
His blood shall be shed."

It is obvious that the third member of the sentence, "for in the image of God made he man," sheds no light at all on the previous words. Of all the versions given above, the most important is doubtless that of the Seventy; and this, while it affords some countenance to capital punishments, does so by giving the whole passage an expiatory meaning, so that Calmet rightly paraphrases the LXX,

"Celui qui repandra le sang humain sera mis au mort *pour expier* ce sang."

Calmet himself advocates the punishment of death on the authority of this passage, and Luther and Diodati take the same view.

(7.) But setting authority aside, and applying ourselves only to the meaning of the words, what sense can we suppose in the translation of Ostervald, the most exact of all?

"Whoso sheddeth the blood of man that is in man,
His blood shall be shed."

If, with Wycliffe, Jerome, and Scio, we suppose the words "*that is in man*" are but a pleonasm, we may leave them out, or treat them as we treat other pleonasms, "He opened his mouth and said," and similar phrases. It does appear that this is the right view; the phrase seems to resemble such as the following:

"The fruit of a tree bearing seed *whose seed is in itself.*"

"Who knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of a man *that is in him?*"

And then we shall be led to conclude that the *best* translation is that by the author of the Vulgate,

"Whosoever sheddeth human blood, his blood shall be shed."

And the passage will rank with this,

"All they that take the sword shall perish by the sword."‡

We have devoted so much time to the examination of this passage, because it is allowed to be the strongest; it is a declaration of God himself, speaking immediately, and not by prophet or patriarch in a dream or in a vision; it is præ-mosaic, and consequently cannot be treated as a part of the Jewish ceremonial code.

(8.) I think we have shown that this most formidable text is too doubtful in its meaning, susceptible of too many interpretations, to be taken as the chief support of capital punishment. We have seen how difficult it is to ascertain whether the blood of the murderer is to be shed "*by man,*" or not,—whether the text contains a command, or merely a threat; and we have remarked that the best authorities, the LXX among the ancients, and Calmet among the moderns, who *do* accept it as speaking of the punishment of death, take care to show that they regard the death of the murderer *as an expiatory sacrifice.* There results, then, from this investigation, two probabilities:

One, that there is no command remaining to us of older dates than Moses, to condemn the murderer to death.

Secondly, that if such command do exist, and the 9th chapter of Genesis present it, it can no longer be applicable in our days, inasmuch as the death of a murderer among us cannot be an expiatory sacrifice.

Of these probabilities, I am satisfied with the first. Nor does it in the slightest degree matter to my argument if it could be shown that the punishment of death was really practised among the patriarchs; because, as we have already shown, their practice can be no sufficient pattern for us by reason of the different moral code under which they lived. But—

V.—(1.) We pass by a natural transition from the theory to the practice of the præ-mosaic world, and we find three homicides, two of which at least were murders: 1. The death of Abel. 2. The slaughter of a young man by Lamech. 3. The massacre of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi. The two former mere not only præ-mosaic but also antediluvian. The history of the first murderer is very striking; as soon as his crime had been committed, he was called by his Maker to receive judgment, and here one would suppose that if it had been intended to link together, by a perpetual connection, murder and death by law, Cain would have been immediately put to death; but we find not only the fratricide spared, but not a single word spoken concerning death as a legal punishment. Nay, when Cain himself expressed his fears lest he should fall a victim rather to vengeance than to justice, God made an especial covenant with him *that he should not be slain.* The term, "The Lord set a mark upon Cain," and which Rabbi Joseph, one of the doctors of the Talmud, wisely supposes to have been a long horn growing out of his forehead, signifies rather "The Lord appointed a sign or token unto Cain."

(2.) Many hasty readers have supposed that it must have been a needless fear on the part of Cain that he might be killed when we only hear of three persons beside him in the world. But if we recollect that this event took place in the hundred and twenty-ninth year of the world, the lowest probable calculation will give us a population of upwards of twelve hundred persons. (for further information on this topic see Dodd and Clarke *in loco.*) Here we obtain a very remarkable element in our reasoning; the rising population of the young world had before their eyes the spectacle of a murderer, nay a fratricide; they beheld him banished from the presence of God; condemned to be a fugitive and a vagabond on the earth; they heard the ground doubly cursed for him; and they yet knew that God had guaranteed the life of this vagabond, this fratricide, by a special covenant!

(3.) Let us turn to the case of Lamech. In about the year of the world 500, and consequently 370 years after the murder of Abel, we find another homicide. Lamech, the fifth in descent from Cain, is introduced as speaking, in the earliest metrical verse extant, of his having slain a man—into the particulars of this event we have no means of inquiring. St. Jerome, following some Jewish traditions, says, that Lamech had accidentally slain his unhappy ancestor, the first murderer. If the great Latin Father be right, the passage is calculated to cast an awful light upon that which we have already discussed. Prior to it in chronology, it might be alluded to in the covenant which Jehovah made with Noah. There might be, and probably were, persons in the family of that patriarch to whom such allusion might be peculiarly needful. But whoever was the person to whose death Lamech was, whether accidentally or not, accessary; and, I confess, I do not see how Cain could be called "a young man;" certain it is, from the context, that Adah and Zillah, Lamech's wives, were in alarm for the consequences of his act. Referring to the previous case of Cain, he desired them to banish their fears, and addressed them thus:—

"Adah and Zillah, hear my voice,
Ye wives of Lamech, hearken to my speech,—
I have slain a man for wounding me;
A young man for bruising me;
If Cain be avenged seven-fold,
Surely Lamech seventy and seven."

In the uncertainty of the circumstances, not knowing whether Lamech slew a young man in self-defence, or destroyed him afterwards in revenge, our arguments cannot be so strong from this case as from that of Cain; but there are clues given to us here which may help us to at least a probable account of these circumstances.

(*Remainder next week.*)

* Levit. xxiv. 18, *et seq.* † Exod. xxi. 28, *et seq.*

* Heb. x. 26. † Communion Service, Consecration Prayer. ‡ Matt. xix. 8. § Acts xvii. 30. ‖ Psalm lv. 23. ¶ Isaiah i. 20. ** Matt. xviii. 6.

* MS. Sion College. † Calmet, vol. i. p. 84. ‡ Matt. xxvi. 52.

From Niles's Register.

ORIGIN OF RAILWAYS.

The Germans, to the credit of having been the inventors of printing, of powder, and of clocks, now produce a claim of having invented railways. It is affirmed that the late Mr. *Fredericks*, engineer of Hanover, was the first who thought of constructing a machine for the conveyance of heavy loads, while visiting the mines of Silesia, and he subsequently invented iron rails, exactly as they are now in use; also a locomotive engine and cart to run from the Dovitiry silver mine, upon the Haregnion mountain, Hanover, to the place of refinement, Poucherich, a distance of about an hour's drive. The cart was a four wheeled one, and on its frame was a wooden chest, filled with the mineral of from 60 to 80 cwt. The guide sat upon the driving box like a coachman, and was able, by pressure, to direct or arrest the cart at any rate of speed. The evidences connected with this origin of the railway and locomotive is proved by persons still living, who rode in it. The distance requiring a walk of 45 minutes was thus performed by the king and queen in 5. The inventor subsequently executed a drawing for an English gentleman, who, as Mr. Fredericks said a short time before his death, "wishes to run my new cart in his own country as I do here. He admires it, and I take great care in executing my work, in order to prove that we here are not a set of block-heads." This invention was thus transferred to England, where Mr. Thomas Gray, of Exeter, was finally instrumental in introducing it; and, after the application of steam to boats, the steam locomotive was introduced. These important facts have just been made known, and they show that the claims of England to this, as to almost every other invention made by others, are not to be sustained.

ARTIFICIAL FUEL.

Some curious experiments were exhibited on Thursday week, at No. 3, Trafalgar-square, to test the powers of an invention by a Mr. Parsons, and known by the title of "Corke's Economic Firing." The fuel consists of blocks resembling natural coal, but lighter in weight, and more cleanly to the touch. The blocks are of different shapes and sizes, and are so moulded or made as to be suitable to all kinds of fire-grates or stoves. They ignite immediately on the application of flame, and burn with great brilliancy and strength either in combination with mineral or natural coal, or coke, or cinders, and emit a great heat. Against a block of coal of equal size, they showed superiority in duration of burning, and were more lively, burning till all vestiges disappeared. There was an invention of this sort some years ago, but it did not succeed. the fuel throwing out sparks, and, as it died away, emitting a most disagreeable and mephitic vapor and smell, somewhat like peat. This fuel of Mr. Corke's is free from those defects; indeed there was but little smoke, the whole force of the concrete being concentrated in the radiant heat of the red-hot mass and the flame. From what was exhibited, it would appear that this artificial coal is applicable to all purposes for which natural coal is used; and it certainly, from the rapidity with which the combustion of it is produced, is better adapted for many purposes of emergency or of luxury, than even the produce of the best Wall's-end mines or veins. It is professed to be considerably cheaper than coal.—*Times.*

PROGRESS OF CHEMISTRY IN FRANCE.—M. Barruel conceived the idea of making a medal from the iron which might be collected from the blood of a subject. The wife of one of the celebrated members of the Ecole de Medicine of Paris, wears a ring, made of iron, which was extracted from blood taken from her husband during the course of a severe disease. It is stated that a French *elegante* wears an ornamental pin made from a human tooth, which was chased as ivory might have been. If the assertion that sufficient iron may be extracted from the blood of forty-five men to form a ploughshare, be correct, there would be no difficulty in procuring enough for a medal from one subject; valuable, because durable relics might thus be obtained of noted individuals.

Tampico.—The schooner Gold Huntress, Captain Church, arrived yesterday from Tampico. Captain C. informs us that he sailed from Aransas on the 18th November, and arrived at Tampico on the 24th, where he was ordered by the authorities of the place not to communicate with the shore, the officer of the port assigning as a reason, that the schooner was from an enemy's port. In the port of Tampico there were two man-of-war schooners, and from 1,000 to 1,500 Mexican troops were encamped in the neighborhood of Tampico, under the command of General Peredes.—*N. O. Times, December* 24.

Education and Industry!

THE Northampton Association of Education and Industry have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of 15 or 20 boarding pupils. They will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of Education, assisted by his wife, and other teachers, and will be subject to the same treatment and regulations as pupils who are members of the association. The name of the association indicates the idea of culture, towards the realization of which our efforts will be directed. Systematic, habitual industry is deemed indispensable to education, which should aim at the harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious tendencies in active, practical life.

We shall consider $100 a year as an equivalent for instruction and board; from which a suitable deduction will be made when a pupil comes for several years. The year will commence on the 1st of May, next, and will have no fixed and entire vacation. Pupils will be received for a year at any time.

O. MACK